John Carter Brown.

10.35 very scarce
Offered by P. & Sons Jan 1918 12.50

THE

TRIAL

OF

John Peter Zenger,

OF

NEW-YORK, PRINTER;

Who was Tried and Acquitted,

For PRINTING and PUBLISHING a LIBEL againſt the Government.

WITH

The PLEADINGS and ARGUMENTS on both Sides.

Ita CUIQUE *eveniat, ut de* REPUBLICA *meruit.* CIC.

LONDON:

Printed for P. BROWN, in *Fleet-Sreeet.* MDCCLII.

[Price One Shilling and Sixpence.]

JOHN CARTER BROWN.

PREFACE.

AS ſome of our Readers may perhaps be unacquainted with the Form of Government in the Province of New-York, *we muſt inform them, that in that Province, as well as moſt of the* Britiſh *Plantations in* America, *the Form of Government is the very ſame with that in* England; *as it conſiſts of a Governor, a Council, and an Aſſembly. The Governor is named by the King, and repreſents the Sovereign within the Province of which he is appointed Governor: The Council conſiſts of a certain Number of Members, all of whom are named by the King, and reſembles the Houſe of Lords here in* England, *being for that Reaſon ſometimes called the Upper-houſe of Aſſembly; and the Aſſembly conſiſts of a Number of Repreſentatives choſen by the People in their ſeveral Pariſhes or Diſtricts, reſembling the Houſe of Commons here in* England, *and for that Reaſon are often called the Lower-houſe of Aſſembly. Theſe Three Branches of the Legiſlature have, within their Province, the ſame Powers and Privileges that the King, Lords and Commons have here at Home, and their Acts have*

the

the ſame Force, if not diſapproved by his Majeſty; conſequently a Reſolution of either Houſe of Aſſembly meets generally with the ſame Reſpect from the People within the Province, that a Reſolution of either Houſe of Parliament does here in England; *but in this Caſe of* Zenger's, *tho' the Council had by their Reſolution declared the Papers publiſhed by him to be* falſe, ſcandalous, malicious and ſeditious Libels, *as the Jury upon his Trial were upon their Oaths, and thereby bound to deliver their own Opinion, and not that of the Council, they thought themſelves obliged to acquit the Priſoner, by returning a Verdict,* Not Guilty; *which is the Verdict every Jury-man is in Conſcience bound to return, if he thinks that the Priſoner is not Guilty of the Crime charged in the Indictment or Information.*

A BRIEF

NARRATIVE

OF THE

CASE and TRIAL

OF

JOHN PETER ZENGER,

Printer of the NEW-YORK *Weekly Journal.*

ZENGER's firſt News-Paper was printed, *Nov.* 5, 1733, and he continued printing and publiſhing them, to the public Satisfaction, till the *January* following; when the Chief Juſtice was pleaſed to animadvert upon the Doctrine of Libels, in a long Charge given in that Term to the Grand Jury, of which *Zenger*'s Papers was the principal Object; and afterwards on the third *Tueſday* of *October*, 1734, was again pleaſed to charge the Grand Jury, and cloſed his Harangue in the following Words:

" *Gen-*

" *Gentlemen*,

" I ſhall conclude with reading a Paragraph or two out of the ſame Book, concerning *Libels*; they are arrived to that Height, that they call loudly for your Animadverſion; it is high Time to put a Stop to them; for at the rate things are now carried on, when all Order and Government are endeavoured to be trampled on, and Reflections are caſt upon Perſons of all Degrees, muſt not theſe Things end in Sedition, if not timely prevented? Lenity, you have ſeen, will not avail; it becomes you then to enquire after the Offenders, that we may, in a due Courſe of Law, be enabled to puniſh them. If you, *Gentlemen*, do not interpoſe, conſider whether the ill Conſequences that may ariſe from any Diſturbances of the public Peace, may not in part lie at your Door?

" *Hawkins*, in his Chapter of Libels, conſiders three Points.

" 1ſt, What ſhall be ſaid to be a Libel.

" 2dly, Who are liable to be puniſhed for it.

" 3dly, In what Manner they are to be puniſhed.

" Under the 1ſt, he ſays, §. 7. Nor can there be
" any Doubt, but that a Writing which defames a pri-
" vate Perſon only is as much a Libel as that which
" defames Perſons intruſted in a public Capacity, in
" as much as it manifeſtly tends to create ill Blood, and
" to cauſe a Diſturbance of the public Peace; how-
" ever, it is certain, that it is a very high Aggravation
" of a Libel, that it tends to ſcandalize the Govern-
" ment, by reflecting on thoſe who are entruſted with
" the Adminiſtration of public Affairs, which does not
" only endanger the public Peace, as all other Libels
" do, by ſtirring up the Parties immediately concerned
" in it to Acts of Revenge, but alſo has a direct Ten-
" dency to breed in the People a Diſlike of their Go-
" vernors, and incline them to Faction and Sedition.
" As to the 2d Point he ſays, §. 10. It is certain

" not

" not only he who compoſes or procures another to
" compoſe it, but alſo that he who publiſhes or pro-
" cures another to publiſh it, are in Danger of being
" puniſhed for it; and it is ſaid not to be material, whe-
" ther he who diſperſes a Libel knew any thing of
" the Contents or Effects of it or not; for nothing
" could be more eaſy than to publiſh the moſt viru-
" lent Papers with the greateſt Security, if the con-
" cealing the Purport of them from an illiterate Pub-
" liſher, would make him ſafe in the diſperſing them:
" Alſo it has been ſaid, that if he who hath either
" read a Libel himſelf, or hath heard it read by ano-
" ther, do afterwards maliciouſly read or report any
" Part of it in the Preſence of others, or lend or ſhew
" it to another, he is guilty of an unlawful Publica-
" tion of it. Alſo, it hath been holden, that the copy-
" ing of a Libel ſhall be a concluſive Evidence of the
" Publication of it, unleſs the Party can prove, that he
" delivered it to a Magiſtrate to examine it, in which
" Caſe the Act *ſubſequent* is ſaid to explain the Inten-
" tion *precedent*. But it ſeems to be the better Opi-
" nion, that he who firſt writes a Libel, dictated by
" another, is thereby guilty of making of it, and
" conſequently puniſhable for the bare Writing; for
" it was no Libel till it was reduced to Writing."

" Theſe, *Gentlemen*, are ſome of the Offences which are to make Part of your Enquiries; and if any other ſhould ariſe in the Courſe of your Proceedings, in which you are at a Loſs, or conceive any Doubts, upon your Application here, We will aſſiſt and direct you."

But the Grand Jury not indicting *Zenger* as expected, the Gentlemen of the Council proceeded to take his Papers into Conſideration, and ſent the following Meſſage to the General Aſſembly.

" *Die Jovis*, 3 *ho.* P. M. 17*th of October*, 1734.

" A Meſſage from the Council by *Philip Cortland*, in theſe Words:

" That Board having had ſeveral of *Zenger*'s *New-York Weekly Journals* laid before them, and other ſcurrilous Papers, tending to alienate the Affections of the People of this Province from his Majeſty's Government, to raiſe Seditions and Tumults among the People of this Province, and to fill their Minds with a Contempt of his Majeſty's Government: And conſidering the pernicious Conſequences that may attend ſuch growing Evils, if not ſpeedily and effectually put a Stop to: And conceiving that the moſt likely Method to put a Stop to ſuch bold and ſeditious Practices, to maintain the Dignity of His Majeſty's Government, and to preſerve the Peace thereof, would be by a Conference between a Committee of this Board, and a Committee of the Aſſembly; it is therefore ordered, That the Gentlemen of this Board, NOW ASSEMBLED, or any Seven of them, be a Committee, to join a Committee of the Houſe of Repreſentatives, in order to confer together, and to examine and enquire into the ſaid Papers, and the Authors and Writers thereof.

" Which Meſſage being read,

" *Ordered*, That the Members of this Houſe, or any Fourteen of them, do meet a Committee of the Council, at the Time and Place therein mentioned."

" *Die Veneris*, 9 *ho.* A. M. 18 *October*, 1734.

" Mr. *Garretſon*, from the Committee of this Houſe, reported, That they laſt Night met the Committee of the Council, on the Subject-matter of their Meſſage of Yeſterday to this Houſe; and that after ſeveral Preliminaries between the ſaid Committees, the Gentlemen of the Council reduced to Writing, what they requeſted of this Houſe, and delivered the ſame to the Chair-

man,

man, who delivered it in at the Table, and being read, is in the Words following:

" At a Committee of the Council held the 17th of *October*, 1734.

PRESENT.

Mr. *Clarke*,	Mr. *Harriſon*,	Dr. *Colden*,
Mr. *Livingſton*,	Mr. *Kennedy*,	Mr. Ch. Juſtice,
Mr. *Cortland*,	Mr. *Lane*,	Mr. *Horſmanden*.

" *Gentlemen*,

" The Matters we requeſt your Concurrence in, are, That *Zenger*'s Papers, No. 7. 47. 48. 49. which were read, and which we now deliver, be burnt by the Hands of the common Hangman, as containing in them many Things derogatory of the Dignity of His Majeſty's Government, reflecting upon the Legiſlature, upon the moſt conſiderable Perſons in the moſt diſtinguiſhed Stations in the Province, and tending to raiſe Seditions and Tumults among the People thereof.

" That you concur with us in the Addreſſing the Governor, to iſſue His Proclamation, with a Promiſe of Reward for the Diſcovery of the Authors or Writers of theſe ſeditious Libels.

" That you concur with us in an Order for proſecuting the Printers thereof.

" That you concur with us in an Order to the Magiſtrates, to exert themſelves in the Execution of their Offices, in order to preſerve the public Peace of the Province.

" *By Order of the Committee*,
Fred. Morris, Cl. Con."

" Mr. *Garretſon* delivered likewiſe to the Houſe the ſeveral Papers referred to in the ſaid Requeſt.

" *Ordered*, That the ſaid Papers be lodged with the Clerk of this Houſe, and that the Conſideration thereof, and the ſaid Requeſt, be referred till *Tueſday* next."

" *Die*

" *Die Martis*, 9 *ho.* A. M. 22 *October*, 1734.

" The Houſe according to Order proceeded to take into Conſideration the Requeſt of a Committee of Council, delivered to a Committee of this Houſe, on the 16th Inſtant; as likewiſe of the ſeveral Papers therein referred to. And after ſeveral Debates upon the Subject-matters, it was *ORDERED*, THAT THE SAID PAPERS AND REQUEST LIE ON THE TABLE."

The Council, finding the General Aſſembly would not do any thing in it, ſent the following Meſſage to the Houſe.

" *Die Sabbati*, 9 *ho.* A. M. 2 *November*, 1734.

" A Meſſage from the Council by Mr. *Livingſton*, deſiring this Houſe to return by him to that Board, the ſeveral ſeditious Journals of *Zenger*, No. 7. 47. 48. 49. which were delivered by a Committee of that Board to a Committee of this Houſe, the 17th of *October* laſt, together with the Propoſals of a Committee of that Board, delivered therewith to a Committee of this Houſe; and then withdrew."

On *Tueſday* the 5th of *November*, 1734, the *Quarter Seſſions* for the City of *New-York* began, when the Sheriff delivered to the Court AN ORDER, which was read in theſe Words:

" At a Council held at Fort *George*, in *New-York*, the 2d of *November*, 1734.

PRESENT.

His Excellency *William Coſby*, Captain General and Governor in Chief, *&c.*

Mr. *Clarke*,	Mr. *Harriſon*,	Dr. *Colden*,*
Mr. *Livingſton*,	Mr. *Kennedy*,	Mr. Ch. Juſtice,
Mr. *Cortland*,	Mr. *Lane*,	Mr. *Horſmanden*.

" Whereas

* Dr. *Colden* was that Day at *Eſopus*, 90 Miles from *New-York*, tho' mentioned as preſent in Council.

" Whereas by an Order of this Board, of this Day, ſome of *John Peter Zenger*'s Journals entitled, *The New-York Weekly Journal, containing the freſheſt Advices, foreign and domeſtick, No.* 7. 47. 48. 49. were ordered to be burnt by the Hands of the common Hangman, or Whipper, near the Pillory in this City, on *Wedneſday* the 6th Inſtant, between the Hours of Eleven and Twelve in the Forenoon, as containing in them many Things tending to Sedition and Faction, to bring His Majeſty's Government into Contempt, and to diſturb the Peace thereof; and containing in them likewiſe, not only Reflections upon his Excellency the Governor in particular, the Legiſlature in general, but alſo upon the moſt conſiderable Perſons in the moſt diſtinguiſhed Stations in this Province. It is therefore ordered, That the Mayor and Magiſtrates of this City, do attend at the Burning the ſeveral Papers or Journals aforeſaid, numbered as above-mentioned.

Fred. Morris, D. Cl. Con.

" To *Robert Lurting*, Eſq; Mayor of the City of *New-York*, and the reſt of the Magiſtrates of the ſaid City and County."

Upon reading of which ORDER, the Court forbad the Entering thereof in their Books at that Time, and many of them declared, that if it ſhould be entered, they would have their Proteſt entered againſt it.

On *Wedneſday* the 6th of *November*, the Sheriff of *New-York* moved the Court of *Quarter Seſſions*, to comply with the ſaid Order, upon which one of the Aldermen offered a Proteſt, which was read by the Clerk and approved of by all the Aldermen, either expreſsly or by not objecting to it, and is as follows:

" Whereas an ORDER has been ſerved on this Court, in theſe Words:

[*The Order as above inſerted.*]

" And whereas this Court conceives, they are only to be commanded by the King's Mandatory Writs, authorized

thorized by Law, to which they conceive they have the Right of ſhewing Cauſe why they don't obey them, if they believe them improper to be obeyed, or by ORDERS, which have ſome known Laws to authorize them : And as this Court conceives THIS ORDER to be no Mandatory Writ warranted by Law, nor knows of any Law that authorizes the making of the Order aforeſaid ; ſo they think themſelves under no Obligation to obey it : Which Obedience, they think, would be in them, the opening a Door for arbitrary Commands, which, when once opened, they know not what dangerous Conſequences may attend it. Wherefore, this Court conceives itſelf bound in Duty (for the Preſervation of the Rights of this Corporation, and, as much as they can, of the Liberty of the Preſs, and the People of the Province, ſince an Aſſembly of the Province, and ſeveral Grand Juries, have refuſed to meddle with the Papers, when applied to by the Council) *to Proteſt againſt the ORDER aforeſaid, and to forbid all the Members of this Corporation to pay any Obedience to it*, until it be ſhewn to this Court, that the ſame is authorized by ſome known Law, which they neither know nor believe that it is."

Upon reading of which, it was required of the Honourable *Francis Harriſon*, Recorder of this Corporation, and one of the Members of the Council, (preſent at making the ſaid Order) to ſhew by what Law or Authority, the ſaid ORDER was made ; upon which he ſpoke in ſupport of it, and cited the Caſe of Doctor *Sacheverel*'s Sermon, which was by the Houſe of Lords ordered to be burnt by the Hands of the Hangman, and that the Mayor and Aldermen of *London* ſhould attend the doing of it. To which one of the Aldermen anſwered to this Purpoſe : That he conceived the Caſe was no ways parallel, becauſe Doctor *Sacheverel*, and his Sermon, were impeached by the Houſe of Commons of *England*, which is the Grand Jury of the Nation, and Repreſentative of the whole People of *England* ;

England: That this their Impeachment they profecuted before the Houſe of Lords, the greateſt Court of Juſtice in *Britain*, and which, beyond Memory of Man, has had Cognizance of Things of that Nature: That there *Sacheverel* had a fair Hearing in Defence of himſelf and his Sermon; and after that fair Hearing, he and his Sermon were fairly and legally condemned: That he had read the Caſe of Dr. *Sacheverel*, and thought he could charge his Memory, that the Judgement of the Houſe of Lords in that Caſe was, That the Mayor and Sheriffs of *London* and *Middleſex*, only, ſhould attend the Burning of the Sermon, and not the Aldermen; and farther he remembered, that the Order upon that Judgement was only directed to the Sheriffs of *London*, and not even to the Mayor, who did not attend the doing it. And farther ſaid, that would Mr. Recorder ſhew, that the Governor and Council had ſuch Authority as the Houſe of Lords, and that the Papers ordered to be burnt were in like manner legally proſecuted and condemned, there the Caſe of Doctor *Sacheverel* might be to the Purpoſe; but without ſhewing that, it rather proved that a Cenſure ought not to be pronounced, till a fair Trial, by a competent and legal Authority, were firſt had. Mr. Recorder was deſired to produce the Books from whence he cited his Authorities, that the Court might judge of them themſelves; and was told, that if he could produce ſufficient Authorities to warrant THIS ORDER, they would readily obey it, but otherwiſe not. Upon which he ſaid, he did not carry his Books about him. To which it was anſwered, he might ſend for them, or order a Conſtable to fetch them. But upon this he aroſe, and in going away mentioned, That Biſhop *Burnet*'s Paſtoral Letter was ordered, by the Houſe of Lords, to be burnt by the High Bailiff of *Weſtminſter* *. Upon which he

* *Bp* Kennet *ſays, That this Letter ſeemed to be ſacrificed to a poor Jeſt on the Author's Name* [Burn et] —— Complete Hiſt. of *Eng.* Vol. 3. P. 587. 2 Ed. in *Lond.* 1719.

abruptly departed, without waiting for an Anſwer, or promiſing to bring his Books, and did not return to the Court that Sitting.

After Mr. Recorder's Departure, it was moved that the *Proteſt* ſhould be entered, to which it was anſwered, that the *Proteſt* could not be entered without entering alſo the ORDER, and it was not fit to take any Notice of IT; and therefore it was propoſed, that no Notice ſhould be taken in their Books of either, which was unanimouſly agreed to by the Court.

The Sheriff then moved, that the Court would direct their Whipper to perform the ſaid ORDER, to which it was anſwered, That, as he was an Officer of the Corporation, they would give no ſuch ORDER. Soon after which, the Court adjourned, and did not attend the Burning of the Papers. Afterwards about Noon, the Sheriff, after reading the Numbers of the ſeveral Papers which were ordered to be burnt, delivered them into the Hands of his own Negro, and ordered him to put them into the Fire, which he did, at which Mr. Recorder, *Jeremiah Dunbar* Eſq; and ſeveral of the Officers of the Garriſon, attended.

On the Lord's Day the 17th of *November*, 1734, *Zenger* was taken and impriſoned by virtue of a Warrant in theſe Words:

" At a Council held at *Fort-George* in *New-York*, the 2d Day of *November*, 1734.

PRESENT.

His Excellency *William Coſby*, Captain-General and Governor in Chief, *&c.*

Mr. *Clarke*,	Mr. *Harriſon*,	Mr. *Livingſton*,
Mr. *Kennedy*,	Chief Juſtice,	Mr. *Cortland*.
Mr. *Lane*,	Mr. *Horſmanden*,	

" It is ordered that the Sheriff for the City of *New-York*, do forthwith take and apprehend *John Peter Zenger*,

Zenger, for printing and publiſhing ſeveral ſeditious Libels, diſperſed throughout his Journals or News-Papers, entituled, *The New-York Weekly Journal, containing the freſheſt Advices, foreign and domeſtic*; as having in them many Things, tending to raiſe Factions and Tumults among the People of this Province, inflaming their Minds with Contempt of His Majeſty's Government, and greatly diſturbing the Peace thereof; and, upon his taking the ſaid *John Peter Zenger*, *to commit him to the Priſon or common Jail of the ſaid City and County.*

Fred. Morris, *D. Cl. Con.*"

And being by virtue of this Warrant impriſoned in the Jail, he was for ſeveral Days denied the Uſe of Pen, Ink and Paper, and the Liberty of Speech with any Perſons. —— Upon his Commitment, ſome Friends ſoon got a *Habeas Corpus* to bring him before the Chief Juſtice, in order to his Diſcharge or being bailed; on the Return whereof, on *Wedneſday* the 20th of *November*, his Council delivered Exceptions to the Return, and the Chief Juſtice ordered them to be argued publicly at the City-hall, on the *Saturday* following.

On *Saturday* the 23d of *November*, the ſaid Exceptions came to be argued, by *James Alexander* and *William Smith* Council for *Zenger*, and by Mr. Attorney-General and Mr. *Warrel* Council againſt him, in Preſence of ſome Hundreds of the Inhabitants; where his Council (ſaving the Benefit of Exception to the Illegality of the Warrant) inſiſted that he might be admitted to reaſonable Bail. And to ſhew, that it was his Right to be ſo, they offered *Magna Charta*, *The Petition of Right* 3 Car. *The* Habeas Corpus *Act of* 31 Car. 2. which directs the Sum in which Bail is to be taken, to be, "*according to the Quality of the Priſoner, and Nature of the Offence.*" Alſo 2d *Hawkins*, Cap. 15. §. 5. in theſe Words, "*But Juſtices muſt take Care, that, under Pretence of demanding ſufficient Security,*

Security, they do not make ſo exceſſive a Demand, as in effect amounts to a Denial of Bail; for this is looked on as a great Grievance, and is complained of as ſuch, by 1 W. & M. Seſſ. 2d. *by which it is declared,* That exceſſive Bail ought not to be required." It was alſo ſhewn, that the Seven Biſhops, who, in King *James* the IId's Time, were charged with the like Crime that *Zenger* ſtood charged with, were admitted to Bail on their own Recognizances, the Archbiſhop in 200*l.* and each of the other Six in 100*l.* apiece only. Sundry other Authorities and Arguments were produced and inſiſted on by Council, to prove his Right to be admitted to moderate Bail, and to ſuch Bail as was in his Power to give; and ſundry Parts of Hiſtory they produced, to ſhew how much the requiring exceſſive Bail had been reſented by Parliament. And in order to enable the Court to judge what Surety was in his Power to give, he made Affidavit, *That (Debts paid) he was not worth Forty Pounds, the Tools of his Trade and Wearing-Apparel excepted.*

Some warm Expreſſions (to ſay no worſe of them) were dropped on this Occaſion, ſufficiently known and reſented by the Auditory. But upon the whole, it was *Ordered, That he might be admitted to Bail, himſelf in* 400l. *with two Sureties each in* 200l. *and that he ſhould be remanded till he gave it.* And as this was Ten Times more than was in his Power to counter-ſecure any Perſon in giving Bail for him, he conceived he could not aſk any to become his Bail on theſe Terms; and therefore he returned to Jail, where he lay until *Tueſday* the 28th of *January* 1734-5, being the laſt Day of that Term; and the Grand Jury having found nothing againſt him, he expected to have been diſcharged from his Impriſonment: But theſe Hopes proved vain; for the Attorney-General then charged him by *Information*, for printing and publiſhing Parts of his Journals, No. 13. and 23. as being *falſe, ſcandalous, malicious, and ſeditious.*

To

To this Information his Council appeared, and offered Exceptions, leaving a Blank for inſerting the Judges Commiſſions, which the Court were of Opinion not to receive till thoſe Blanks were filled up. In the ſucceeding Vacation the Judges gave Copies of their Commiſſions; and on *Tueſday* the 15th of *April* laſt, the firſt Day of the ſucceeding Term, his Council offered theſe Exceptions; which were as follows:

The Attorney-General, *v.* *John Peter Zenger.* } On Information for a Miſdemeanor.

" Exceptions humbly offered by *John Peter Zenger*, to the Honourable *James De Lancey*, Eſq; to judge in this Cauſe.

" The Defendant comes and prays Hearing of the Commiſſion, by virtue of which the Honourable *James De Lancey*, Eſq; claims the Power and Authority to judge in this Cauſe, and it is read to him in theſe Words:

" GEORGE *the Second, by the Grace of God, King of* Great-Britain, France *and* Ireland, *King, Defender of the Faith*, &c. *To our truſty and well-beloved* James De Lancey, *Eſq; We repoſing ſpecial Truſt and Confidence in your Integrity, Ability and Learning, have aſſigned, conſtituted and appointed, and We do by theſe Preſents aſſign, conſtitute and appoint you the ſaid* James De Lancey, *Eſq; to be Chief Juſtice in and over our Province of* New-York, *in* America, *in the room of* Lewis Morris, *Eſq; giving and by theſe Preſents granting unto you full Power and lawful Authority, to hear, try, and determine all Pleas whatſoever, civil, criminal and mixed, according to the Laws, Statutes and Cuſtoms of Our Kingdom of* England, *and the Laws and Uſages of Our ſaid Province of* New-York, *not being repugnant thereto, and Executions of all Judgments of the ſaid Court to award, and to make ſuch Rules and Orders in the ſaid*

Court

Court as may be found convenient and uſeful, and as near as may be agreeable to the Rules and Orders of our Courts of King's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer in England. *To have, hold, and enjoy the ſaid Office or Place of Chief Juſtice in and over Our ſaid Province, with all and ſingular the Rights, and Privileges, Profits and Advantages, Sallaries, Fees and Perquiſites unto the ſaid Place belonging, or in any ways appertaining, in as full and ample Manner as any Perſon heretofore Chief Juſtice of Our ſaid Province hath held and enjoyed, or of Right ought to have held and enjoyed the ſame, To you the ſaid* James De Lancey, *Eſq; for and* DURING OUR WILL AND PLEASURE. *In Teſtimony whereof we have cauſed theſe our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of our Province of* New-York, *to be hereunto affixed. Witneſs our truſty and well-beloved* WILLIAM COSBY, *Eſq; Our Captain-General and Governor in Chief of our Provinces of* New-York, New-Jerſey, *and the Territories thereon depending in* America, *Vice-Admiral of the ſame, and Colonel in our Army, at* Fort-George *in* New-York, *the Twenty-firſt* Day *of* Auguſt, *in the Seventh Year of our Reign,* Annoq; Domini, 1733."

" Which being read and heard, the ſaid *John Peter Zenger*, by Proteſtation, not confeſſing or ſubmitting to the Power of any other Perſon to judge in this Cauſe, doth except to the Power of the Honourable *James De Lancey*, Eſq; aforeſaid, to judge in this Cauſe, by virtue of the Commiſſion aforeſaid, for theſe Reaſons, *viz.*

" *1ſt.* For that the Authority of a Judge of the *King's-Bench*, in that Part of *Great-Britain* called *England*, by which the Cognizance of this Cauſe is claimed, is by the ſaid Commiſſion granted to the Honourable *James De Lancey*, Eſq; aforeſaid, only *during Pleaſure*; whereas that Authority (by a Statute in that Caſe made and provided) ought to be granted *during good Behaviour.*

" 2*d.*

" 2*d.* For that, by the ſaid Commiſſion, the Juriſdiction and Authority of a Juſtice of the Court of *Common-Pleas* at *Weſtminſter*, in that Part of *Great-Britain* called *England*, is granted to the ſaid *James De Lancey*, Eſq; which Juriſdiction and Authority cannot be granted to, and exerciſed by, any one of the Juſtices of the *King's-Bench.*

" 3*d.* For that the Form of the ſaid Commiſſion is not founded on or warranted by the Common Law, or any Statute of *England*, or of *Great-Britain*, or any Act of Aſſembly in this Colony.

" 4*th.* For that it appears by the Commiſſion aforeſaid, that the ſame is granted under the Seal of this Colony, by his Excellency *William Coſby*, Eſq; Governor thereof; and it appears not, that the ſame was granted, neither was the ſame granted, by and with the Advice and Conſent of His Majeſty's Council of this Colony; without which Advice and Conſent, His Excellency could not grant the ſame.

" Wherefore, and for many other Defects in the ſaid Commiſſion, this Defendant humbly hopes, that the Honourable *James De Lancey*, Eſq; will not take Cognizance of this Cauſe, by virtue of the Commiſſion aforeſaid.

Was ſigned, { *James Alexander*, *William Smith.*"

The Exceptions to the Commiſſion of the Honourable *Frederick Philipſe*, Eſq; the Second Juſtice, were the ſame with the foregoing; his Commiſſion having the ſame Defects.

Tueſday the 15th of *April*, 1735, Mr. *Alexander* offered the above Exceptions to the Court, and prayed that they might be filed. Upon this the Chief Juſtice ſaid to Mr. *Alexander* and Mr. *Smith*, That they ought well to conſider the Conſequences of what they offered; to which both anſwered, That they had well conſidered what they offered, and all the Conſequences.

And

And Mr. *Smith* added, that he was ſo well ſatisfied of *the Right of the Subject to take an Exception to the Commiſſion of a Judge, if he thought ſuch Commiſſion illegal*, that he durſt venture his Life *upon that Point*. As to *the Validity of the Exceptions* then offered, he ſaid, He took that to be *a ſecond Point*; but was ready to argue them both, if their Honours were pleaſed to hear him. To which the Chief Juſtice replied, That he would conſider the Exceptions in the Morning; and ordered the Clerk to bring them to him.

Wedneſday, the 16th of *April*, 1735, The Chief Juſtice delivered one of the Exceptions to the Clerk, and Juſtice *Philipſe* the other, upon which Mr. *Smith* aroſe and aſked the Judges, whether their Honours would hear him upon theſe two Points. 1*ſt*, *That the Subject has a Right to take ſuch Exceptions, if they judged the Commiſſion illegal.* 2*dly*, *That the Exceptions tendered were legal and valid.* To which the Chief Juſtice ſaid, That they would neither hear nor allow the Exceptions; *for* (ſaid he) *you thought to have gained a great Deal of Applauſe and Popularity by oppoſing this Court, as you did the Court of* Exchequer; *but you have brought it to that Point, That either*, We muſt go from the Bench, or You from the Bar: *Therefore we exclude you and Mr.* Alexander *from the Bar*; and delivered a Paper to the Clerk, and ordered it to be entered, which the Clerk entered accordingly, and returned the Paper to the Chief Juſtice; after which, the Chief Juſtice ordered the Clerk to read publicly what he had written; an atteſted Copy whereof follows:

" At a Supreme Court of Judicature held for the Province of *New-York*, at the City-hall of the City of *New-York*, on *Wedneſday*, the 16th Day of *April*, 1735.

PRESENT.

The Hon. *James De Lancey*, Eſq; Chief Juſtice.
The Hon. *Frederick Philipſe*, Eſq; Second Juſtice.

" James

" James Alexander, *Eſq*; *and* William Smith, *Attornies of this Court, having preſumed* (notwithſtanding they were forewarned by the Court of their DISPLEASURE if they ſhould do it) *to ſign, and having actually ſigned, and put into Court, Exceptions, in the Name of* John Peter Zenger ; *thereby denying the Legality of the Judges their Commiſſions* (*tho' in the uſual Form*) and the Being of this Supreme Court. *It is therefore ordered, that, for the ſaid Contempt, the ſaid* James Alexander, *and* William Smith, *be excluded from any farther Practice in this Court* ; *and that their Names be ſtruck ont of the Roll of Attornies of this Court.*

per Cur'. James Lyne, *Cl.*"

After the Order of the Court was read, Mr. *Alexander* aſked, whether it was the Order of Mr. Juſtice *Philipſe* as well as of the Chief Juſtice? To which both anſwered, that it was their Order ; upon which Mr. *Alexander* added, That it was proper to aſk that Queſtion, *That they might know how to have their Relief* : He farther obſerved to the Court, upon reading the Order, That they were miſtaken in their Wording of it, becauſe the Exceptions were *only to their Commiſſions*, and *not to the Being of the Court*, as is therein alleged ; and prayed that the Order might be altered accordingly. The Chief Juſtice ſaid, they conceived the Exceptions were againſt the Being of the Court. Both Mr. *Alexander* and Mr. *Smith* denied that they were, and prayed the Chief Juſtice to point to the Place that contained ſuch Exceptions ; and further added, That the Court might well exiſt, tho' the Commiſſions of all the Judges were void ; which the Chief Juſtice confeſſed to be true : And therefore they prayed again, that the Order in that Point might be altered ; but it was denied.

Then Mr. *Alexander* deſired to know, whether they *over-ruled or rejected* the Exceptions ; the Chief Juſtice

 ſaid,

ſaid, he did not underſtand the Difference; to which Mr. *Alexander* replied, that if he *rejected* the Exceptions they could not appear upon the Proceedings, and in that Caſe the Defendant was entituled to have them made Part of the Proceedings, by Bills of Exceptions: But if they *over-ruled* them, then, by ſo doing, they only declared them not ſufficient to hinder them from proceeding by virtue of thoſe Commiſſions, and the Exceptions would remain as Records of the Court, and ought to be entered on the Record of the Cauſe as Part of the Proceedings. The Chief Juſtice ſaid, "They muſt remain upon the File, to warrant what we have done:" As to being Part of the Record of the Proceedings in that Cauſe, he ſaid, "You may ſpeak to that Point To-morrow."

Friday, *April* 18th, 1735. Mr. *Alexander* ſignified to the Court, That on *Wedneſday* laſt their Honours had ſaid, That the Council for *Zenger* might ſpeak to the Point, concerning the *Rejecting* or *Over-ruling* of *Zenger*'s Exceptions on the Morrow: To which the Chief Juſtice anſwered, That he ſaid, *You may get ſome Perſon to ſpeak to that Point on the Morrow, not meaning that the ſaid* Alexander *ſhould ſpeak to it, that being contrary to the Order.* Both Mr. *Alexander* and Mr. *Smith* ſaid, they underſtood it otherwiſe.

They both alſo mentioned, that it was a Doubt, whether by the Words of the Order they were debarred of their Practice as Council, as well as Attornies, whereas they practiſed in both Capacities? To which the Chief Juſtice anſwered, That the Order was plain, *That* James Alexander, *Eſq*; *and* William Smith, *were debarred and excluded from their whole Practice at this Bar*; *and that the Order was intended to bar their acting both as Council and as Attornies*; *and that it could not be conſtrued otherwiſe*. And it being aſked Mr. *Philipſe*, Whether he underſtood the Order ſo; he anſwered, He did.

Upon

Upon this Excluſion of *Zenger*'s Council, he petitioned the Court to order Council for his Defence, who thereon appointed *John Chambers*, Eſq; who pleaded *Not Guilty* for him to the Information. But as to the Point, *Whether* Zenger's *Exceptions ſhould be part of the Record as was moved by his former Council*, Mr. *Chambers* thought not proper to ſpeak to it. Mr. *Chambers* alſo moved, that a certain Day in the next Term might be appointed for his Trial, and for *a Struck Jury*; whereupon his Trial was ordered to be on *Monday* the 4th of *Auguſt*, and the Court would conſider till the firſt Day of the next Term, whether he ſhould have a Struck Jury or not, and ordered that the Sheriff ſhould in the mean Time, at *Zenger*'s Charge, return the Freeholders Book.

"At a Supreme Court of Judicature held for the Province of *New-York*, before the Honourable *James De Lancey*, Eſq; Chief Juſtice of the ſaid Province; and the Honourable *Frederick Philipſe*, Eſq; Second Juſtice of the ſaid Province.

" On *Tueſday* the 29th of *July*, 1735, the Court opened, and *on Motion of Mr.* Chambers *for a Struck Jury, purſuant to the Rule of the preceding Term, the Court were of Opinion, that* Zenger *was entituled to have a Struck Jury.*"

Accordingly, that Evening at five of the Clock, ſome of his Friends attended the Clerk, for ſtriking the Jury; when, to their Surprize, the Clerk, inſtead of producing the Freeholders Book to ſtrike the Jury out of it in their Preſence as uſual, produced a Liſt of 48 garbled Perſons, whom, he ſaid, he had taken out of the Freeholders Book. *Zenger*'s Friends told him, that a great Number of theſe Perſons were not Freeholders; that others were Perſons holding Commiſſions and Offices at the Governor's Pleaſure; that others,

being of the late diſplaced Magiſtrates of this City, muſt be ſuppoſed to have Reſentment againſt the Priſoner, for what he had printed concerning them; that others were the Governor's Baker, Taylor, Shoemaker, Candlemaker, Joiner, *&c.* that there would not remain a Jury, if they ſtruck out all the exceptionable Men; and according to the Cuſtom, they had only a Right to ſtrick out 12.

But, finding no Arguments could prevail with the Clerk to hear their Objections to his Liſt, nor to ſtrike the Jury as uſual, Mr. *Chambers* told him, he muſt apply to the Court, which the next Morning he did, and the Court upon his Motion, *Ordered, That the* 48 *ſhould be ſtruck out of the Freeholders Book as uſual, in the Preſence of the Parties, and that the Clerk ſhould hear Objections to Perſons propoſed to be of the* 48, *and allow of ſuch Exceptions as were juſt.* In Purſuance of that Order, a Jury was that Evening ſtruck, to the Satisfaction of both Parties.

A U-

AUGUST 4, 1735.

AT a Supreme Court of Judicature held for the Province of *New-York*,

PRESENT,

The Hon. JAMES DE LANCEY, *Esq*; *Chief Justice*,
The Hon. FREDERICK PHILIPSE, *Esq*; *Second Justice*.

The Court being seated, the Defendant *John Peter Zenger*, charged on an Information for printing and publishing two News-papers, which were called Libels against his Excellency the Governor and his Administration, was called, and brought into Court accordingly.

And the Sheriff returned his *Venire* for the Trial of the said Cause.

Mr. *Chambers*, *Council for the Defendant*. I humbly move your Honours that we may have Justice done by the Sheriff, and that he may return the Names of the Jurors in the same Order they were struck.

Chief Justice. How is that? Are they not so returned?

Mr. *Ch*. No, they are not: For some of the Names that were last set down in the Pannel, are now placed first.

Ch. J. Make out that, and you shall be righted.

Mr. *Ch*. I have the Copy of the Pannel in my Hand, as the Jurors were struck, and if the Clerk will produce the Original signed by Mr. Attorney and myself, your Honour will see our Complaint is just.

Ch. J. Clerk, is it so? Look upon that Copy: Is it a true Copy of the Pannel as it was struck?

Clerk.

Clerk. Yes, I believe it is.

Ch. J. How came the Names of the Jurors to be miſplaced in the Pannel annexed to the *Venire?*

Sheriff. I have returned the Jurors in the ſame Order in which the Clerk gave them to me.

Ch. J. Let the Names of the Jurors be ranged in the Order they were ſtruck, agreeable to the Copy here in Court.

Which was done accordingly. And the Jury, whoſe Names were as follows, were called and ſworn.

Hermanus Rutgers,
Stanly Holmes,
Edward Man,
John Bell,
Samuel Weaver,
Andries Marſehalk,
Egbert van Borſom,
Thomas Hunt,
Benjamin Hildreth, Forem.
Abraham Keteltas,
John Goelet,
Hercules Wendover.

Mr. Attorney-General opened the Information, which was as follows:

Mr. Attorney. May it pleaſe your Honours, and you Gentlemen of the Jury: The Information, now before the Court, and to which the Defendant *Zenger* has pleaded *Not Guilty*, is an Information for printing and publiſhing *a falſe, ſcandalous and ſeditious Libel*, in which his Excellency the Governor of this Province, who is the King's immediate Repreſentative here, is greatly and unjuſtly ſcandalized, as a Perſon that has no Regard to Law nor Juſtice: With much more, as will appear upon reading the Information. This of Libelling is what has always been diſcouraged as a Thing that tends to create Differences among Men, ill Blood among the People, and oftentimes great Bloodſhed between the Party libelling and the Party libelled. There can be no Doubt but you Gentlemen of the Jury will have the ſame ill Opinion of ſuch Practices, as the Judges have always ſhewn upon ſuch Occaſions: But I ſhall ſay no more at this Time,

un-

until you hear the Information, which is as follows:

" *New-York*, Supreme Court.

" Of the Term of *January*, in the Eighth Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King GEORGE IId, *&c.*

" *New-York*, *ſs.* BE it remembered, That *Richard Bradley*, Eſq; Attorney-General of Our Sovereign Lord the King, for the Province of *New-York*, who for Our ſaid Lord the King in this Part proſecutes, in his own proper Perſon comes here into the Court of Our ſaid Lord the King, and for Our ſaid Lord the King gives the Court here to underſtand, and be informed,— That *John Peter Zenger*, late of the City of *New-York*, Printer, (being a ſeditious Perſon, and a frequent Printer and Publiſher of falſe News and ſeditious Libels, and wickedly and maliciouſly deviſing the Government of Our ſaid Lord the King of this His Majeſty's Province of *New-York*, under the Adminiſtration of His Excellency *William Coſby*, Eſq; Captain-General and Governor in Chief of the ſaid Province, to traduce, ſcandalize and vilify; and His Excellency the ſaid Governor, and the Miniſters and Officers of Our ſaid Lord the King of and for the ſaid Province to bring into Suſpicion and the ill Opinion of the Subjects of Our ſaid Lord the King reſiding within the ſaid Province) the Twenty-eighth Day of *January*, in the Seventh Year of the Reign of Our Sovereign Lord *George* the Second, by the Grace of God of *Great-Britain*, *France* and *Ireland*, King, Defender of the Faith, *&c.* at the City of *New-York*, *did falſly*, *ſeditiouſly and ſcandalouſly* print and publiſh, and cauſe to be printed and publiſhed, a certain *falſe*, *malicious*, *ſeditious*, *ſcandalous* Libel, intituled, *The New-York Weekly Journal*, *containing the freſheſt Advices foreign and domeſtic*; in which Libel

(of

(of and concerning His Excellency the ſaid Governor, and the Miniſters and Officers of Our ſaid Lord the King, of and for the ſaid Province) among other Things therein contained, are theſe Words: " *Your Appearance in Print at laſt* gives a Pleaſure to many, tho' moſt wiſh you had come fairly into the open Field, and not appeared behind *Retrenchments* made of the ſuppoſed Laws againſt Libelling, and of what other Men have ſaid and done before; theſe *Retrenchments*, Gentlemen, may ſoon be ſhewn to you and all Men to be weak, and to have neither Law nor Reaſon for their Foundation, ſo cannot long ſtand you in ſtead: Therefore, you had much better as yet leave them, and come to what *the People of this City and Province* (the City and Province of *New-York* meaning) think are the Points in Queſtion *(to wit) They* (the People of the City and Province of *New-York* meaning) *think as Matters now ſtand, that their* LIBERTIES *and* PROPERTIES *are precarious, and that* SLAVERY *is like to be intailed on them and their Poſterity, if ſome paſt Things be not amended, and this they collect from many paſt Proceedings.*" (Meaning many of the paſt Proceedings of His Excellency the ſaid Governor, and of the Miniſters and Officers of our ſaid Lord the King, of and for the ſaid Province.) And the ſaid Attorney-General of our ſaid Lord the King, for Our ſaid Lord the King, likewiſe gives the Court here to underſtand and be informed, That the ſaid *John Peter Zenger* afterwards *(to wit)* the Eighth Day of *April*, in the Seventh Year of the Reign of Our ſaid Lord the King, at the City of *New-York* aforeſaid, did *falſly, ſeditiouſly and ſcandalouſly* print and publiſh, and cauſe to be printed and publiſhed, another *falſe, malicious, ſeditious, and ſcandalous* Libel, intituled, *The New-York Weekly Journal, containing the freſheſt Advices foreign and domeſtic.* In which Libel, (of and concerning the Government of the Province of *New-York*, and of and concerning His Excellency the

the ſaid Governor, and the Miniſters and Officers of Our ſaid Lord the King, of and for the ſaid Province) among other Things therein contained, are theſe Words, " *One of our Neighbours* (one of the Inhabitants of *New-Jerſey* meaning) *being in Company, obſerving the Strangers* (ſome of the Inhabitants of *New-York* meaning) *full of Complaints, endeavoured to perſuade them to remove into* Jerſey ; *to which it was replied, that would be leaping out of the Frying-pan into the Fire* ; *for, ſays he, we both are under the ſame Governor* (His Excellency the ſaid Governor meaning) *and your Aſſembly have ſhewn with a Witneſs what is to be expected from them : One that was then moving to* Penſilvania, (meaning one that was then removing from *New-York*, with Intent to reſide at *Penſilvania) to which Place it is reported ſeveral conſiderable Men are removing* (from *New-York* meaning) *expreſſed, in Terms very moving, much Concern for the Circumſtances of* New-York, (the bad Circumſtances of the Province and the People of *New-York* meaning) *ſeemed to think them very much owing to the Influence that ſome Men* (whom he called *Tools) had in the Adminiſtration*, (meaning the Adminiſtration of Government of the ſaid Province of *New-York) ſaid he was now going from them, and was not to be hurt by any Meaſures they ſhould take, but could not help having ſome Concern for the Welfare of his Countrymen, and ſhould be glad to hear that the Aſſembly* (meaning the General Aſſembly of the Province of *New-York) would exert themſelves as became them, by ſhewing that they have the Intereſt of their Country more at Heart, than the Gratification of any private View of any of their Members, or being at all affected by the Smiles or Frowns of a Governor*, (His Excellency the ſaid Governor meaning) *both which ought equally to be deſpiſed, when the Intereſt of their Country is at ſtake. You, ſays he, complain of the Lawyers, but I think the Law itſelf is at an End*, We (the People of the Province of *New-York* meaning) See Mens' Deeds destroy-

ED, JUDGES ARBITRARILY DISPLACED, NEW COURTS ERECTED WITHOUT CONSENT OF THE LEGISLATURE (within the Province of *New-York* meaning) BY WHICH IT SEEMS TO ME, TRIALS BY JURIES ARE TAKEN AWAY WHEN A GOVERNOR PLEASES, (His Excellency the ſaid Governor meaning) MEN OF KNOWN ESTATES DENIED THEIR VOTES, CONTRARY TO THE RECEIVED PRACTICE, THE BEST EXPOSITOR OF ANY LAW: *Who is then in that Province* (meaning the Province of *New-York) that call* (can call meaning) *any Thing his own, or enjoy any Liberty* (Liberty meaning) *longer than thoſe in the Adminiſtration* (meaning the Adminiſtration of Government of the ſaid Province of *New-York) will condeſcend to let them do it, for which Reaſon I have left it,* (the Province of *New-York* meaning) *as I believe more will.*" To the great Diſturbance of the Peace of the ſaid Province of *New-York*, to the great Scandal of Our ſaid Lord the King, of His Excellency the ſaid Governor, and of all others concerned in the Adminiſtration of the Government of the ſaid Province, and againſt the Peace of Our Sovereign Lord the King, His Crown and Dignity, *&c.* Whereupon the ſaid Attorney-General of Our ſaid Lord the King, for Our ſaid Lord the King, prays the Adviſement of the Court here, in the Premiſes, and the due Proceſs of the Law, againſt him the ſaid *John Peter Zenger*, in this Part to be done, to anſwer to Our ſaid Lord the King of and in the Premiſes, *&c.*

R. Bradley, Attorney-General."

Mr. *Ch.* To this Information the Defendant has pleaded *Not Guilty*, and we are ready to prove it.

[Mr. *Chambers* was not pleaſed to favour *Zenger* with his Notes, ſo that for Fear of doing him Injuſtice, his Arguments cannot be ſet down. But here Mr. *Chambers* ſet forth very clearly the Nature

ture of a Libel, the great Allowances that ought to be made for what Men ſpeak or write : That in all Libels there muſt be ſome particular Perſons ſo clearly pointed out, that no Doubt muſt remain about who is meant : That he was in Hopes Mr. *Attorney* would fail in his Proof, as to this Point ; and therefore deſired that he would go on to examine his Witneſſes.]

Then Mr. *Hamilton*, who, at the Requeſt of ſome of *Zenger*'s Friends, was ſo kind as to come from *Philadelphia* to aſſiſt him on his Trial, ſpoke.

Mr. *Hamilton*. May it pleaſe your Honour ; I am concerned in this Cauſe on the Part of Mr. *Zenger* the Defendant. The Information againſt my Client was ſent me, a few Days before I left Home, with ſome Inſtructions to let me know how far I might rely upon the Truth of thoſe Parts of the Papers ſet forth in the Information, and which are ſaid to be libellous. And tho' I am perfectly of the Opinion with the Gentleman who has juſt now ſpoke, on the ſame Side with me, as to the common Courſe of Proceedings, I mean in putting Mr. Attorney upon proving, that my Client printed and publiſhed thoſe Papers mentioned in the Information ; yet I cannot think it proper for me (without doing Violence to my own Principles) to deny the Publication of a Complaint, which I think is the Right of every free-born Subject to make, when the Matters ſo publiſhed can be ſupported with Truth ; and therefore I'll ſave Mr. Attorney the Trouble of examining his Witneſſes to that Point ; and I do (for my Client) confeſs, that he both printed and publiſhed the two News-papers ſet forth in the Information, and I hope in ſo doing he has committed no Crime.

Mr. *Attorney*. Then if your Honour pleaſes, ſince Mr. *Hamilton* has confeſſed the Fact, I think our Wit-

 neſſes

neſſes may be diſcharged; we have no further Occaſion for them.

Mr. *Hamilton.* If you brought them here, only to prove the printing and publiſhing of theſe Newspapers, we have acknowleged that, and ſhall abide by it.

[Here *Zenger*'s Journeyman and two Sons (with ſeveral others ſubpœna'd by Mr. Attorney, to give Evidence againſt him) were diſcharged, and there was Silence in the Court for ſome Time.]

Mr. Chief Juſtice. Well, Mr. Attorney, will you proceed?

Mr. Attorney. Indeed, Sir, as Mr. *Hamilton* has confeſſed the printing and publiſhing theſe Libels, I think the Jury muſt find a Verdict for the King; for ſuppoſing they were true, the Law ſays that they are not the leſs libellous for that; nay indeed the Law ſays, their being true is an Aggravation of the Crime.

Mr. *Hamilton.* Not ſo neither, Mr. Attorney, there are two Words to that Bargain. I hope it is not our bare printing and publiſhing a Paper, that will make it a Libel: You will have ſomething more to do, before you make my Client a Libeller; for the Words themſelves muſt be libellous, that is, *falſe, ſcandalous, and ſeditious*, or elſe we are not guilty.

[As Mr. Attorney has not been pleaſed to favour us with his Argument, which he read, or with the Notes of it, we cannot take upon us to ſet down his Words, but only to ſhew the Book-Caſes he cited, and the general Scope of his Argument, which he drew from thoſe Authorities. He obſerved upon the Excellency, as well as Uſe of Government, and the great Regard and Reverence, which had been conſtantly paid to it, both under the Law and the Goſpel. That by Govern-

vernment we were protected in our Lives, Religion and Properties; and that, for these Reasons, great Care had always been taken to prevent every thing that might tend to scandalize Magistrates, and others concerned in the Administration of the Government, especially the Supreme Magistrate. And that there were many Instances of very severe Judgments, and of Punishments inflicted upon such, as had attempted to bring the Government into Contempt; by publishing false and scurrilous Libels against it, or by speaking evil and scandalous Words of Men in Authority; to the great Disturbance of the public Peace. And to support this, he cited, 5 *Coke* 121. (It should be 125.) *Wood's Instit.* 430. 2 *Lilly* 168. 1 *Hawkins* 73. 11. 6. From these Books he insisted, that a Libel was a malicious Defamation of any Person, expressed either in Printing or Writing, Signs or Pictures, to aspersе the Reputation of one that is alive, or the Memory of one that is dead; if he is a private Man, the Libeller deserves a severe Punishment, but if it is against a Magistrate or other public Person, it is a greater Offence; for this concerns not only the Breach of the Peace, but the Scandal of the Government; for what greater Scandal of Government can there be, than to have corrupt or wicked Magistrates to be appointed by the King, to govern his Subjects under him? And a greater Imputation to the State cannot be, than to suffer such corrupt Men to sit in the sacred Seat of Justice, or to have any Concern in the Administration of Justice: And from the same Books Mr. Attorney insisted, that whether the Person defamed is a private Man or a Magistrate, whether living or dead, whether the Libel is true or false, or if the Party against whom it is made is of good or evil Fame, it is nevertheless

a Libel: For in a ſettled State of Government, the Party grieved ought to complain for every Injury done him, in the ordinary Courſe of the Law. And as to its Publication, the Law had taken ſo great Care of Mens' Reputations, that if one maliciouſly repeats, or ſigns it, in the Preſence of another, or delivers the Libel or a Copy of it over, to ſcandalize the Party, he is to be puniſhed as a Publiſher of a Libel. He ſaid it was likewiſe evident, that Libelling was an Offence againſt the Law of God. *Act.* xxiii. 5. *Then ſaid* Paul, *I wiſt not, Brethren, that he was the High-Prieſt: For it is written, thou ſhalt not ſpeak Evil of the Ruler of the People.* 2 Pet. ii. 10. *Deſpiſe Government, preſumptuous are they, ſelf-willed, they are not afraid to ſpeak Evil of Dignities*, &c. He then inſiſted, that it was clear, both by the Law of God and Man, That it was a very great Offence to ſpeak Evil of, or to revile, thoſe in Authority over us; and that Mr. *Zenger* had offended in a moſt notorious and groſs Manner, in ſcandalizing his Excellency our Governor, who is the King's immediate Repreſentative, and the Supreme Magiſtrate of this Province: For can there be any thing more ſcandalous ſaid of a Governor than what is publiſhed in thoſe Papers? Nay, not only the Governor, but both the Council and Aſſembly are ſcandalized; for there it is plainly ſaid, That " As Matters now ſtand, their Liberties and Properties are precarious, and that Slavery is like to be entailed on them and their Poſterity." *And then again Mr.* Zenger *ſays*, " The Aſſembly ought to deſpiſe the Smiles or Frowns of a Governor: That he thinks the Law is at an End: That we ſee Mens' Deeds deſtroyed, Judges arbitrarily diſplaced, New Courts erected without Conſent of the Legiſlature: *And* that it ſeems Trials by Juries are

taken

taken away when a Governor pleaſes: That none can call any thing their own, longer than thoſe in the Adminiſtration will condeſcend to let them do it."——And Mr. Attorney added, that he did not know what could be ſaid in Defence of a Man, who had ſo notoriouſly ſcandalized the Governor and principal Magiſtrates and Officers of the Government, by charging them with depriving the People of their Rights and Liberties, and taking away Trial by Juries, and in ſhort, putting an End to the Law itſelf.—— If this was not a Libel, he ſaid, he did not know what was one. Such Perſons as will take thoſe Liberties with Governors and Magiſtrates, he thought ought to ſuffer for ſtirring up Sedition and Diſcontent among the People. And concluded by ſaying, that the Government had been very much traduced and expoſed by Mr. *Zenger*, before he was taken Notice of: That at laſt it was the Opinion of the Governor and Council, that he ought not to be ſuffered to go on to diſturb the Peace of the Government, by publiſhing ſuch Libels againſt the Governor and the Chief Perſons in the Government; and therefore they had directed this Proſecution, to put a Stop to this ſcandalous and wicked Practice, of libelling and defaming His Majeſty's Government and diſturbing His Majeſty's Peace.]

Mr. *Chambers* then ſummed up to the Jury, obſerving, with great Strength of Reaſon, on Mr. Attorney's Defect of Proof, that the Papers in the Information were *falſe*, *malicious* or *ſeditious*, which was incumbent on him to prove to the Jury, and without which they could not on their Oaths ſay, *That they were ſo, as charged.*

Mr.

Mr. *Hamilton.* May it pleaſe your Honour; I agree with Mr. Attorney, that Government is a ſacred Thing; but I differ very widely from him when he would inſinuate, that the juſt Complaints of a Number of Men, who ſuffer under a bad Adminiſtration, is libelling that Adminiſtration. Had I believed that to be Law, I ſhould not have given the Court the Trouble of hearing any thing that I could ſay in this Cauſe. I own, when I read the Information, I had not the Art to find out (without the Help of Mr. Attorney's *Innuendoes)* that the Governor was the Perſon meant in every Period of that News-paper; and I was inclined to believe, that they were wrote by ſome, who, from an extraordinary Zeal for Liberty, had miſconſtrued the Conduct of ſome Perſons in Authority into Crimes; and that Mr. Attorney, from his too-great Zeal for Power, had exhibited this Information, to correct the Indiſcretion of my Client; and at the ſame Time, to ſhew his Superiors the great Concern he had, leſt they ſhould be treated with any undue Freedom. But from what Mr. Attorney has juſt now ſaid, *to wit*, That this Proſecution was directed by the Governor and Council; and from the extraordinary Appearance of People of all Conditions, which I obſerve in Court upon this Occaſion, I have Reaſon to think, that thoſe in the Adminiſtration have by this Proſecution ſomething more in View, and that the People believe they have a good deal more at Stake, than I apprehend: And therefore, as it is become my Duty, to be both plain and particular in this Cauſe, I beg Leave to beſpeak the Patience of the Court.

I was in Hopes, as that terrible Court, where thoſe dreadful Judgments were given, and that Law eſtabliſhed, which Mr. Attorney has produced for Authorities to ſupport this Cauſe, was long ago laid aſide, as the moſt dangerous Court to the Liberties of the People of *England* that ever was known in that Kingdom; that Mr. Attorney, knowing this, would not have

have attempted to ſet up a Star-Chamber here, nor to make their Judgments a Precedent to us: For it is well known, that what would have been judged Treaſon in thoſe Days for a Man to ſpeak, I think has ſince not only been practiſed as lawful, but the contrary Doctrine has been held to be Law.

In *Brewſter*'s Caſe, for Printing, *That the Subjects might defend their Rights and Liberties by Arms, in caſe the King ſhould go about to deſtroy them*, he was told by the Chief Juſtice that it was a great Mercy, he was not proceeded againſt for his Life; for that to ſay, the King could be reſiſted by Arms in any Caſe whatſoever, was expreſs Treaſon. And yet we ſee ſince that Time, Dr. *Sacheverel* was ſentenced in the higheſt Court in *Great-Britain*, for ſaying, *That ſuch a Reſiſtance was not lawful.* Beſides, as Times have made very great Changes in the Laws of *England*, ſo in my Opinion there are many good Reaſons that Places ſhould do ſo too.

Is it not ſurprizing to ſee a Subject, upon his receiving a Commiſſion from the King to be a Governor of a Colony in *America*, immediately imagining himſelf to be veſted with all the Prerogatives belonging to the ſacred Perſon of his Prince? And, which is yet more aſtoniſhing, to ſee that a People can be ſo wild as to allow of and acknowlege thoſe Prerogatives and Exemptions, even to their own Deſtruction? Is it ſo hard a Matter to diſtinguiſh between the Majeſty of our Sovereign, and the Power of a Governor of the Plantations? Is not this making very free with our Prince, to apply that Regard, Obedience and Allegiance to a Subject which is due only to our Sovereign? And yet in all the Caſes which Mr. Attorney has cited, to ſhew the Duty and Obedience we owe to the Supreme Magiſtrate, it is the King that is there meant and underſtood, tho' Mr. Attorney is pleaſed to urge them as Authorities to prove the Heinouſneſs of Mr. *Zenger*'s Offence againſt the Governor of *New-York*.

The ſeveral Plantations are compared to ſo many large Corporations, and perhaps not improperly; and can any one give an Inſtance, that the Mayor or Head of a Corporation, ever put in a Claim to the ſacred Rights of Majeſty? Let us not (while we are pretending to pay a great Regard to our Prince and his Peace) make bold to transfer that Allegiance to a Subject, which we owe to our King only. What ſtrange Doctrine is it, to preſs every Thing for Law here which is ſo in *England?* I believe we ſhould not think it a Favour, at preſent at leaſt, to eſtabliſh this Practice. In *England* ſo great a Regard and Reverence is had to the Judges, * that if any Man ſtrikes another in *Weſtminſter-Hall*, while the Judges are ſitting, he ſhall loſe his Right-hand, and forfeit his Land and Goods, for ſo doing. And tho' the Judges here claim all the Powers and Authorities within this Government, that a Court of *King's-Bench* has in *England*; yet I believe Mr. Attorney will ſcarcely ſay, that ſuch a Puniſhment could be legally inflicted on a Man for committing ſuch an Offence, in the Preſence of the Judges ſitting in any Court within the Province of *New-York*. The Reaſon is obvious; a Quarrel or Riot in *New-York* cannot poſſibly be attended with thoſe dangerous Conſequences that it might in *Weſtminſter-Hall*; nor (I hope) will it be alleged, that any Miſbehaviour to a Governor in the Plantations will, or ever ought to be, judged of or puniſhed, as a like Undutifulneſs would be to our Sovereign. From all which, I hope Mr. Attorney will not think it proper to apply his Law-Caſes (to ſupport the Cauſe of his Governor) which have only been judged where the King's Safety or Honour was concerned. It will not be denied, but that a Freeholder in the Province of *New-York* has as good a Right to the ſole and ſeparate Uſe of his Lands, as a Freeholder in *England*, who has a Right to bring an Action of Treſpaſs againſt his Neighbour, for ſuffering his Horſe or

* C. 3 *Inſt.* 140.

or Cow to come and feed upon his Lands or eat his Corn, whether incloſed or not incloſed ; and yet I believe it would be looked upon as a ſtrange Attempt, for one Man here to bring an Action againſt another, whoſe Cattle and Horſes feed upon his Grounds not incloſed, or indeed for eating and treading down his Corn, if that were not incloſed. Numberleſs are the Inſtances of this kind that might be given, to ſhew, that what is good Law at one Time and in one Place, is not ſo at another Time and in another Place ; ſo that I think, the Law ſeems to expect, that in theſe Parts of the World Men ſhould take Care, by a good Fence, to preſerve their Property, from the Injury of unruly Beaſts. And perhaps there may be as good Reaſon why Men ſhould take the ſame Care, to make an honeſt and upright Conduct a Fence and Security againſt the Injury of unruly Tongues.

Mr. *Attorney*. I don't know what the Gentleman means, by comparing Caſes of Freeholders in *England* with the Freeholders here. What has this Caſe to do with Actions of Treſpaſs, or Men's fencing their Ground? The Caſe before the Court is, whether Mr. *Zenger* is guilty of libelling his Excellency the Governor of *New-York*, and indeed the whole Adminiſtration of the Government ? Mr. *Hamilton* has confeſſed the printing and publiſhing, and I think nothing is plainer, than that the Words in the Information are *ſcandalous, and tend to Sedition, and to diſquiet the Minds of the People of this Province.* And if ſuch Papers are not Libels, I think it may be ſaid, there can be no ſuch Thing as a Libel.

Mr. *Hamilton*. May it pleaſe your Honour ; I cannot agree with Mr. Attorney : For tho' I freely acknowlege, that there are ſuch Things as Libels, yet I muſt inſiſt at the ſame Time, that what my Client is charged with is not a Libel ; and I obſerved juſt now, that Mr. Attorney, in defining a Libel, made Uſe of the Words, *ſcandalous, ſeditious, and tend to diſquiet the*

People: but (whether with Deſign or not I will not ſay) he omitted the Word *falſe*.

Mr. Attorney. I think I did not omit the Word *falſe:* But it has been ſaid already, that it may be a Libel, notwithſtanding it may be true.

Mr. *Hamilton.* In this I muſt ſtill differ with Mr. Attorney; for I depend upon it, we are to be tried upon this Information now before the Court and Jury, and to which we have pleaded *Not Guilty*, and by it we are charged with printing and publiſhing *a certain falſe, malicious, ſeditious and ſcandalous Libel.* This Word *falſe* muſt have ſome Meaning, or elſe how came it there? I hope Mr. Attorney will not ſay, he put it there by Chance, and I am of Opinion his Information would not be good without it. But to ſhew that it is the principal Thing which, in my Opinion, makes a Libel, I put the Caſe, the Information had been for printing and publiſhing a certain *true* Libel, would that be the ſame Thing? Or could Mr. Attorney ſupport ſuch an Information by any Precedent in the *Engliſh* Law? No, the Falſhood makes the Scandal, and both make the Libel. And to ſhew the Court that I am in good Earneſt, and to ſave the Court's Time, and Mr. Attorney's Trouble, I will agree, that if he can prove the Facts charged upon us, to be *falſe*, I'll own them to be *ſcandalous*, *ſeditious* and *a Libel.* So the Work ſeems now to be pretty much ſhortened, and Mr. Attorney has now only to prove the Words *falſe*, in order to make us Guilty.

Mr. Attorney. We have nothing to prove; you have confeſſed the printing and publiſhing; but if it was neceſſary (as I inſiſt it is not) how can we prove a Negative? But I hope ſome Regard will be had to the Authorities that have been produced, and that ſuppoſing all the Words to be true, yet that will not help them: Chief Juſtice *Holt*, in his Charge to the Jury, in the Caſe of *Tutchin*, made no Diſtinction, whether *Tutchin*'s Papers were *true* or *falſe*; and as

Chief

Chief Juſtice *Holt* has made no Diſtinction in that Caſe, ſo none ought to be made here; nor can it be ſhewn in all that Caſe, there was any Queſtion made about their being *falſe* or *true*.

Mr. *Hamilton*. I did expect to hear, That a Negative cannot be proved; but every Body knows there are many Exceptions to that general Rule: For if a Man is charged with killing another, or ſtealing his Neighbour's Horſe, if he is innocent in the one Caſe, he may prove the Man, ſaid to be killed, to be really alive; and the Horſe, ſaid to be ſtolen, never to have been out of his Maſter's Stable, *&c.* and this I think is proving a Negative. But we will ſave Mr. Attorney the Trouble of proving a Negative, and take the *Onus probandi* upon ourſelves, and prove thoſe very Papers that are called Libels to be *true*.

Mr. Ch. Juſtice. You cannot be admitted, Mr. *Hamilton*, to give the Truth of a Libel in Evidence. A Libel is not to be juſtified; for it is nevertheleſs a Libel that it is *true*.

Mr. *Hamilton*. I am ſorry the Court has ſo ſoon reſolved on that Piece of Law; I expected firſt to have been heard to that Point. I have not in all my Reading met with an Authority that ſays, we cannot be admitted to give the Truth in Evidence, upon an Information for a Libel.

Mr. Ch. Juſtice. The Law is clear, That you cannot juſtify a Libel.

Mr. *Hamilton*. I own that, may it pleaſe your Honour, to be ſo; but, with Submiſſion, I underſtand the Word *(juſtify)* there, to be a Juſtification by Plea, as it is in the Caſe upon an Indictment for *Murder*, or an *Aſſault and Battery*; there the Priſoner cannot *Juſtify*, but plead *Not Guilty*: Yet it will not be denied but he may be, and always is, admitted to give the Truth of the Fact, or any other Matter, in Evidence, which goes to his Acquital; as in Murder, he may prove it was in Defence of his Life, his Houſe, *&c.* and

in

in Aſſault and Battery, he may give in Evidence, that the other Party ſtruck firſt, and in both Caſes he will be acquitted. And in this Senſe I underſtand the Word *juſtify*, when applied to the Caſe before the Court.

Mr. Ch. Juſtice. I pray ſhew, that you can give the Truth of a Libel in Evidence.

Mr. *Hamilton.* I am ready, both from what I underſtand to be the Authorities in the Caſe, and from the Reaſon of the Thing, to ſhew that we may lawfully do ſo. But here I beg leave to obſerve, That Informations for Libels is a Child, if not born, yet nurſed up and brought to full Maturity, in the Court of Star-Chamber.

Mr. Ch. Juſtice. Mr. *Hamilton* you'll find yourſelf miſtaken; for in *Coke's Inſtitutes* you'll find Informations for Libels, long before the Court of Star-Chamber.

Mr. *Hamilton.* I thank your Honour; that is an Authority I did propoſe to ſpeak to by-and-by: But as you have mentioned it, I'll read that Authority now. I think it is in 3 *Co. Inſt.* under Title *Libel*; it is the Caſe of *John de Northampton* for a Letter wrote to *Robert de Ferrers*, one of the King's Privy-Council, * concerning Sir *William Scot*, Chief Juſtice, and his Fellows; but it does not appear to have been upon Information; and I have good Grounds to ſay it was upon Indictment, as was the Caſe of *Adam de Ravenſworth*, juſt mentioned before by Lord *Coke* under the ſame Title; and I think there cannot be a greater, at leaſt a plainer, Authority for us, than the Judgment in the Caſe of *John de Northampton*, which my Lord has ſet down at large. *Et quia prædictus Johannes cognovit dictam Literam per ſe ſcriptam Roberto de Ferrers, qui eſt de Concilio Regis, qua litera continet in ſe nullam veritatem, &c.* Now Sir, by this Judgment it appears the libellous Words were utterly falſe, and there

* Coke, 3 *Inſt.* 174.

there the Falſhood was the Crime, and is the Ground of that Judgment: And is not that what we contend for? Do not we inſiſt, that the Falſhood makes the Scandal, and both make the Libel? And how ſhall it be known, whether the Words are libellous, *that is*, *true* or *falſe*, but by admitting us to prove them *true*, ſince Mr. Attorney will not undertake to prove them *falſe?* Beſides, is it not againſt common Senſe, that a Man ſhould be puniſhed in the ſame Degree for a *true Libel* (if any ſuch Thing could be) as for a *falſe one?* I know it is ſaid, " That Truth makes a Libel the more provoking, and therefore the Offence is the greater, and conſequently the Judgment ſhould be the heavier." Well, ſuppoſe it were ſo, and let us agree for once, That " Truth is a greater Sin than Falſehood;" yet as the Offences are not equal, and as the Puniſhment is arbitrary, that is, according as the Judges in their Diſcretion ſhall direct to be inflicted; is it not abſolutely neceſſary that they ſhould know, whether the Libel is *true* or *falſe*, that they may by that Means be able to proportion the Puniſhment? For, would it not be a ſad Caſe, if the Judges, for want of a due Information, ſhould chance to give as ſevere a Judgment againſt a Man for writing or publiſhing a Lie, as for writing or publiſhing a Truth? And yet this (with Submiſſion) as monſtrous and ridiculous as it may ſeem to be, is the natural Conſequence of Mr. Attorney's Doctrine, That " Truth makes a worſe Libel than Falſhood," and muſt follow from his not proving our Papers to be *falſe*, or not ſuffering us to prove them to be *true*. But this is only reaſoning upon the Caſe, and I will now proceed to ſhew, what in my Opinion will be ſufficient to induce the Court, to allow us to prove the Truth of the Words, which in the Information are called libellous. And firſt, I think there cannot be a greater Authority for us, than the Judgment I juſt now mentioned, in the Caſe of *John de Northampton*, and that was in early Times, and be-

fore

fore the Star-Chamber came to its Fulneſs of Power and Wickedneſs. In that Judgment, as I obſerved, the *Falſhood* of the Letter which was wrote, is aſſigned as the very Ground of the Sentence. And agreeable to this it was urged by Sir *Robert Sawyer*, * in the Trial of the Seven Biſhops, *That the Falſity, the Malice, and Sedition of the Writing, were all Facts to be proved.* But here it may be ſaid, Sir *Robert* was one of the Biſhops' Council, and his Argument is not to be allowed for Law: But I offer it only to ſhew, that we are not the firſt who have inſiſted, that to make a Writing a Libel it muſt be *falſe*. And if the Argument of a Council muſt have no Weight, I hope there will be more Regard ſhewn to the Opinion of a Judge, and therefore I mention the Words of Juſtice *Powel* in the ſame Trial, where he ſays (of the Petition of the Biſhops, which was called a Libel, and upon which they were proſecuted by Information) That, "To make it a Libel, it muſt be falſe and malicious, and tend to Sedition;" and declared, "As he ſaw no Falſhood or Malice in it, he was of Opinion, that it was no Libel." Now I ſhould think this Opinion alone, in the Caſe of the King, and in a Caſe which the King had ſo much at Heart, and which to this Day has never been contradicted, might be a ſufficient Authority, to entitle us to the Liberty of proving the *Truth* of the Papers, which in the Information are called *falſe*, *malicious*, *ſeditious and ſcandalous*. If it be objected, *That the Opinions of the other three Judges were againſt him*; I anſwer, That the Cenſures the Judgments of theſe Men have undergone, and the Approbation Juſtice *Powel*'s Opinion, his Judgment and Conduct upon that Trial has met with, and the Honour he gained to himſelf, for daring to ſpeak Truth at ſuch a Time, upon ſuch an Occaſion, and in the Reign of ſuch a King, are more than ſufficient, in my humble Opinion, to warrant our inſiſting on his Judg-

* *State Trials*, Vol. 4.

Judgment, as a full Authority to our Purpoſe; and it will lie upon Mr. Attorney to ſhew, that this Opinion has ſince that Time been denied to be Law, or that Juſtice *Powel*, who delivered it, has ever been condemned or blamed for it in any Law-Book extant at this Day; and this I will venture to ſay, Mr. Attorney cannot do. But to make this Point yet more clear, if any Thing can be clearer, I will on our Part proceed and ſhew, that in the Caſe of Sir *Samuel Barnardiſton*, his Council, notwithſtanding he ſtood before one of the greateſt Monſters that ever preſided in an *Engliſh* Court (Judge *Jefferies*) inſiſted on the Want of Proof to the *Malice* and *ſeditious Intent* of the Author of what was called a *Libel*. And in the Caſe of *Tutchin*, which ſeems to be Mr. Attorney's chief Authority, that Caſe is againſt him; for he was upon his Trial put upon ſhewing the Truth of his Papers, but did not, at leaſt the Priſoner was aſked, by the King's Council, * whether he would ſay they were *true*? And as he never pretended, that they were true, the Chief Juſtice was not to ſay ſo. But the Point will ſtill be clearer on our Side from *Fuller*'s Caſe, for falſly and wickedly cauſing to be printed a falſe and ſcandalous Libel, in which (amongſt other Things) were contained theſe Words: "Mr. *Jones* has alſo made Oath, That he paid 5000 *l.* more by the late King's Order, to ſeveral Perſons in Places of Truſt, that they might complete my Ruin, and invalidate me for ever. Nor is this all; for the ſaid Mr. *Jones* will prove by undeniable Witneſs and Demonſtration, that he has diſtributed more than 180,000 *l.* in eight Years laſt paſt, by the *French* King's Order, to Perſons in public Truſt in this Kingdom." Here you ſee is a ſcandalous and infamous Charge againſt the late King; here is a Charge no leſs than High-Treaſon, againſt the *Men in public Truſt*, for receiving Money of the *French* King, then in actual War with the Crown of *Great-*

* *State Trials*, Vol. V. 445.

Britain; and yet the Court were far from bearing him down with Star-Chamber Doctrine, *to wit*, *That it was no matter*, *whether what he ſaid was true or falſe*; no; on the contrary, Lord Chief Juſtice *Holt* aſks *Fuller*, "Can you make it appear, they are true? Have you any Witneſſes? You might have had *Subpœnas* for your Witneſſes againſt this Day. If you take upon you to write ſuch Things as you are charged with, it lies upon you to prove them true, at your Peril. If you have any Witneſſes, I will hear them. How came you to write thoſe Books which are not true? If you have any Witneſſes, produce them. If you can offer any Matter to prove what you have wrote, let us hear it." Thus ſaid, and thus did, that great Man Lord Chief Juſtice *Holt*, upon a Trial of the like Kind with ours, and the Rule laid down by him in this Caſe is, "That he who will take upon him to write Things, it lies upon him to prove them at his Peril." Now, Sir, we have acknowleged the printing and publiſhing of thoſe Papers, ſet forth in the Information, and (with the Leave of the Court) agreeable to the Rule laid down by Chief Juſtice *Holt*, we are ready to prove them to be true, at our Peril.

Mr. Ch. Juſtice. Let us ſee the Book.

[Here the Court had the Caſe under Conſideration, a conſiderable Time, and every one was ſilent.]

Mr. Ch. Juſtice. Mr. Attorney, you have heard what Mr. *Hamilton* has ſaid, and the Caſes he has cited, for having his Witneſſes examined, to prove the Truth of the ſeveral Facts contained in the Papers ſet forth in the Information. What do you ſay to it?

Mr. Attorney. The Law in my Opinion is very clear; they cannot be admitted to juſtify a Libel; for, by the Authorities I have already read to the Court, it

is

is not the leſs a Libel becauſe it is true. I think I need not trouble the Court with reading the Caſes over again: The Thing ſeems to be very plain, and I ſubmit it to the Court.

Mr. Ch. Juſtice. Mr. *Hamilton*, the Court is of Opinion, you ought not to be permitted to prove the Facts in the Papers: Theſe are the Words of the Book, " It is far from being a Juſtification of a Libel, that the Contents thereof is true, or that the Perſon upon whom it is made had a bad Reputation, ſince the greater Appearance there is of Truth in any malicious Invective, ſo much the more provoking it is."

Mr. *Hamilton.* Theſe are Star-Chamber Caſes, and I was in Hopes, that Practice had been dead with the Court.

Mr. Ch. Juſt. Mr. *Hamilton*, the Court have delivered their Opinion, and we expect you will uſe us with Good-manners; you are not to be permitted to argue againſt the Opinion of the Court.

Mr. *Hamilton.* With Submiſſion, I have ſeen the Practice in very great Courts, and never heard it deemed unmannerly to——

Mr. Ch. Juſt. After the Court have declared their Opinion, it is not Good-manners to inſiſt upon a Point, in which you are over-ruled.

Mr. *Hamilton.* I will ſay no more at this Time; the Court I ſee is againſt us in this Point; and that I hope I may be allowed to ſay.

Mr. Ch. Juſt. Uſe the Court with Good-manners, and you ſhall be allowed all the Liberty you can reaſonably deſire.

Mr. *Hamilton.* I thank your Honour. Then Gentlemen of the Jury, it is to you we muſt now appeal, for Witneſſes, to the Truth of the Facts we have offered, and are denied the Liberty to prove; and let it not ſeem ſtrange, that I apply myſelf to you in this Manner; I am warranted ſo to do both by Law and

Reaſon. The Law ſuppoſes you to be ſummoned, *out of the Neighbourhood where the Fact is alleged to be committed*; and the Reaſon of your being taken out of the Neighbourhood is, *becauſe you are ſuppoſed to have the beſt Knowlege of the Fact that is to be tried.* And were you to find a Verdict againſt my Client, you muſt take upon you to ſay, the Papers referred to in the Information, and which we acknowlege we printed and publiſhed, are *falſe, ſcandalous and ſeditious*; but of this I can have no Apprehenſion. You are Citizens of *New-York*; you are really what the Law ſuppoſes you to be, *honeſt and lawful Men*; and, according to my Brief, the Facts which we offer to prove were not committed in a Corner; they are notoriouſly known to be true; and therefore in your Juſtice lies our Safety. And as we are denied the Liberty of giving Evidence, to prove the Truth of what we have publiſhed, I will beg Leave to lay it down as a ſtanding Rule in ſuch Caſes, *That the ſuppreſſing of Evidence ought always to be taken for the ſtrongeſt Evidence*; and I hope it will have that Weight with you. But ſince we are not admitted to examine our Witneſſes, I will endeavour to ſhorten the Diſpute with Mr. Attorney, and to that End, I deſire he would favour us with ſome Standard Definition of a Libel, by which it may be certainly known, whether a Writing be a Libel, yea or not.

Mr. Attorney. The Books, I think, have given a very full Definition of a Libel; they ſay * it is "In a ſtrict Senſe taken for a malicious Defamation, expreſſed either in writing or printing, and tending either to blacken the Memory of one who is dead, or the Reputation of one who is alive, and to expoſe him to public Hatred, Contempt or Ridicule. §. 2. But it is ſaid, That in a larger Senſe the Notion of a Libel may be applied to any Defamation whatſoever, expreſſed either by Signs or Pictures, as by fixing up a Gallows againſt

* 1 *Hawk. Chap.* 73. §. 1. *& ſeq.*

againſt a Man's Door, or by painting him in a ſhameful and ignominious Manner. §. 3. And ſince the chief Cauſe for which the Law ſo ſeverely puniſhes all Offences of this Nature, is the direct Tendency of them to a Breach of public Peace, by provoking the Parties injured, their Friends and Families to Acts of Revenge, which it would be impoſſible to reſtrain by the ſevereſt Laws, were there no Redreſs from public Juſtice for Injuries of this kind, which of all others are moſt ſenſibly felt; and ſince the plain Meaning of ſuch Scandal, as is expreſſed by Signs or Pictures, is as obvious to common Senſe, and as eaſily underſtood by every common Capacity, and altogether as provoking as that which is expreſſed by writing or printing, why ſhould it not be equally criminal? §. 4. And from the ſame Ground it ſeemeth alſo clearly to follow, That ſuch Scandal as is expreſſed in a ſcoffing and ironical Manner, makes a Writing as properly a Libel, as that which is expreſſed in direct Terms; as where a Writing, in a taunting Manner reckoning up ſeveral Acts of public Charity done by one, ſays, *You will not play the* Jew, *nor the* Hypocrite, and ſo goes on in a Strain of Ridicule to inſinuate, that what he did was owing to his Vain-Glory; or where a Writing, pretending to recommend to one the Characters of ſeveral great Men for his Imitation, inſtead of taking Notice of what they are generally eſteemed famous for, pitched on ſuch Qualities only which their Enemies charge them with the Want of, as by propoſing ſuch a one to be imitated for his Courage, who is known to be a great Stateſman, but no Soldier, and another to be imitated for his Learning, who is known to be a great General, but no Scholar, *&c.* which kind of Writing is as well underſtood to mean only to upbraid the Parties with the Want of theſe Qualities, as if it had directly and expreſsly done ſo.

Mr. *Hamilton.* Ay, Mr. Attorney; but what certain Standard-Rule have the Books laid down, by which

which we can certainly know, whether the Words or the Signs are malicious? Whether they are defamatory? Whether they tend to the Breach of the Peace, and are a ſufficient Ground to provoke a Man, his Family, or Friends to Acts of Revenge, eſpecially thoſe of the ironical ſort of Words? And what Rule have you to know when I write ironically? I think it would be hard, when I ſay, *ſuch a Man is a very worthy honeſt Gentleman, and of fine Underſtanding*, that therefore I meant *he was a Knave or a Fool.*

Mr. Attorney. I think the Books are very full; it is ſaid in 1 *Hawk. p.* 193. juſt now read, "That ſuch Scandal as is expreſſed in a ſcoffing and ironical Manner, makes a Writing as properly a Libel, as that which is expreſſed in direct Terms; as where a Writing, in a taunting Manner ſays, reckoning up ſeveral Acts of Charity done by one, ſays, *you will not play the* Jew *or the* Hypocrite, and ſo goes on to inſinuate, that what he did was owing to his Vain-Glory, *&c.* Which kind of Writing is as well underſtood to mean only to upbraid the Parties with the Want of theſe Qualities, as if it had directly and expreſsly done ſo." I think nothing can be plainer or more full than theſe Words.

Mr. *Hamilton.* I agree the Words are very plain, and I ſhall not ſcruple to allow (when we are agreed that the Words are *falſe and ſcandalous, and were ſpoken in an ironical and ſcoffing Manner*, &c.) that they are really *libellous*; but here ſtill occurs the Uncertainty, which makes the Difficulty to know, what Words are *ſcandalous* and what not; for you ſay, they may be *ſcandalous*, *true* or *falſe*; beſides, how ſhall we know whether the Words were ſpoke in a *ſcoffing and ironical Manner*, or ſeriouſly? Or how can you know, whether the Man did not think as he wrote? For by your Rule, if he did, it is no *Irony*, and conſequently no *Libel.* But under Favour, Mr. Attorney, I think the ſame Book, and the ſame Section will ſhew us the only

Rule

Rule by which all theſe Things are to be known. The Words are theſe; " Which kind of Writing is as well UNDERSTOOD to mean only to upbraid the Parties with the Want of theſe Qualities, as if they had directly and expreſsly done ſo." Here it is plain, the Words are *ſcandalous*, *ſcoffing and ironical*, only as they are UNDERSTOOD: I know no Rule laid down in the Books but this; I mean, as the Words are *underſtood*.

Mr. Ch. Juſt. Mr. *Hamilton*, do you think it ſo hard to know, when Words are ironical, or ſpoke in a ſcoffing Manner?

Mr. *Hamilton.* I own it may be known; but I inſiſt, the only Rule to know is, as I do or can *underſtand* them; I have no other Rule to go by, but as I *underſtand* them.

Mr. Ch. Juſt. That is certain. All Words are libellous or not, as they are *underſtood.* Thoſe who are to judge of the Words, muſt judge whether they *are ſcandalous* or *ironical, tend to the Breach of the Peace*, or are *ſeditious:* There can be no Doubt of it.

Mr. *Hamilton.* I thank your Honour; I am glad to find the Court of this Opinion. Then it follows that thoſe twelve Men muſt *underſtand* the Words in the Information to be *ſcandalous*, that is to ſay *falſe*; for I think it is not pretended they are of the *ironical* Sort; and when they underſtand the Words to be ſo, they will ſay we are guilty of publiſhing a *falſe Libel*, and not otherwiſe.

Mr. Ch. Juſt. No, Mr. *Hamilton*; the Jury may find that *Zenger* printed and publiſhed thoſe Papers, and leave it to the Court to judge whether they are libellous; you know this is very common; it is in the Nature of a ſpecial Verdict, where the Jury leave the Matter of Law to the Court.

Mr. *Hamilton.* I know, may it pleaſe your Honour, the Jury may do ſo; but I do likewiſe know, they

may

may do otherwiſe. I know they have the Right beyond all Diſpute, to determine both the Law and the Fact, and where they do not doubt of the Law, they ought to do ſo. This of leaving it to the Judgment of the Court, *whether the Words are libellous or not*, in effect renders Juries uſeleſs (to ſay no worſe) in many Caſes; but this I ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak to by-and-by; and I will, with the Court's Leave, proceed to examine the Inconveniences that muſt inevitably ariſe from the Doctrines Mr. Attorney has laid down; and I obſerve, in ſupport of this Proſecution, he has frequently repeated the Words taken from the Caſe of *Libel, famoſus*, in 5 *Co.* This is indeed the leading Caſe, and to which almoſt all the other Caſes upon the Subject of Libels do refer; and I muſt inſiſt upon ſaying, That according as this Caſe ſeems to be underſtood by the Court and Mr. Attorney, it is not Law at this Day: For tho' I own it to be baſe and unworthy to ſcandalize any Man, nay I think it is even villanous to ſcandalize a Perſon of public Character, and I will go ſo far into Mr. Attorney's Doctrine as to agree, that if the Faults, Miſtakes, nay even the Vices of ſuch a Perſon be private and perſonal, and do not affect the Peace of the Public, or the Liberty or Property of our Neighbour, it is unmanly and unmannerly to expoſe them either by Word or Writing. But when a Ruler of a People brings his perſonal Failings, but much more his Vices, into his Adminiſtration, and the People find themſelves affected by them, either in their Liberties or Properties, that will alter the Caſe mightily, and all the high Things that are ſaid in Favour of Rulers, and of Dignities, and upon the Side of Power, will not be able to ſtop People's Mouths when they feel themſelves oppreſſed, I mean in a free Government. It is true in Times paſt it was a Crime to ſpeak Truth, and in that terrible Court of Star-Chamber, many worthy and brave Men ſuffered for ſo doing; and yet even in that Court, and in thoſe

bad

bad Times, a great and good Man durſt ſay, what I hope will not be taken amiſs of me to ſay in this Place, *to wit, The Practice of Informations for Libels is a Sword in the Hands of a wicked King, and an arrand Coward, to cut down and deſtroy the Innocent; the one cannot, becauſe of his high Station, and the other dares not, becauſe of his want of Courage, revenge himſelf in another Manner.*

Mr. Attorney. Pray, Mr. *Hamilton*, have a Care what you ſay, do not go too far neither, I do not like thoſe Liberties.

Mr. *Hamilton.* Sure, Mr. Attorney, you won't make any Applications; all Men agree, that we are governed by the beſt of Kings, and I cannot ſee the Meaning of Mr. Attorney's Caution: My well-known Principles, and the Senſe I have of the Bleſſings we enjoy under His preſent Majeſty, makes it impoſſible for me to err, and I hope, even to be ſuſpected, in that Point of Duty to my King. May it pleaſe your Honour, I was ſaying, That notwithſtanding all the Duty and Reverence claimed by Mr. Attorney to Men in Authority, they are not exempt from obſerving the Rules of common Juſtice, either in their private or public Capacities; the Laws of our Mother-Country know no Exemption. It is true, Men in Power are harder to be come at for Wrongs they do, either to a private Perſon, or to the Public; eſpecially a Governor in the Plantations, where they inſiſt upon an Exemption from anſwering Complaints of any kind in their own Government. We are indeed told, and it is true they are obliged to anſwer a Suit in the King's Courts at *Weſtminſter*, for a Wrong done to any Perſon here: But do we not know how impracticable this is to moſt Men among us, to leave their Families (who depend upon their Labour and Care for their Livelihood) and carry Evidences to *Britain*, and at a great, nay, a far greater Expence than almoſt any of us are able to bear, only to proſecute a Governor for an Injury

done here. But when the Oppreſſion is general, there is no Remedy even that Way: However, our Conſtitution has (bleſſed be God) given us an Opportunity, if not to have ſuch Wrongs redreſſed, yet by our Prudence and Reſolution we may in a great Meaſure prevent the committing of ſuch Wrongs, by making a Governor ſenſible that it is his Intereſt to be juſt to thoſe under his Care; for ſuch is the Senſe that Men in general (I mean Freemen) have of common Juſtice, that when they come to know, that a chief Magiſtrate abuſes the Power with which he is truſted, for the Good of the People, and is attempting to turn that very Power againſt the Innocent, whether of high or low Degree; I ſay, Mankind in general ſeldom fail to interpoſe, and, as far as they can, prevent the Deſtruction of their Fellow-ſubjects. And has it not often been ſeen (and I hope it will always be ſeen) that when the Repreſentatives of a free People are, by juſt Repreſentations or Remonſtrances, made ſenſible of the Sufferings of their Fellow-ſubjects, by the Abuſe of Power in the Hands of a Governor, they have declared (and loudly too) that they were not obliged by any Law to ſupport a Governor who goes about to deſtroy a Province or Colony, or their Privileges, which by His Majeſty he was appointed, and by the Law he is bound, to protect and encourage. But I pray it may be conſidered of what Uſe is this mighty Privilege, if every Man that ſuffers muſt be ſilent? And if a Man muſt be taken up as a Libeller, for telling his Sufferings to his Neighbour? I know it may be anſwered, *Have you not a Legiſlature? Have you not a Houſe of Repreſentatives to whom you may complain?* And to this I anſwer, we have. But what then? Is an Aſſembly to be troubled with every Injury done by a Governor? Or are they to hear of nothing but what thoſe in the Adminiſtration will pleaſe to tell them? Or what ſort of a Trial muſt a Man have? And how is he to be remedied; eſpecially if

the

the Caſe were, as I have known it to happen in *America* in my Time, That a Governor who has Places (I will not ſay Penſions, for I believe they ſeldom give that to another which they can take to themſelves) to beſtow, and can or will keep the ſame Aſſembly (after he has modeled them ſo as to get a Majority of the Houſe in his Intereſt) for near *twice Seven Years* together? I pray, what Redreſs is to be expected for an honeſt Man, who makes his Complaint againſt a Governor, to an Aſſembly who may properly enough be ſaid, to be made by the ſame Governor againſt whom the Complaint is made? The Thing anſwers itſelf. No, it is natural, it is a Privilege; I will go farther, it is a Right which all Freemen claim, and are intituled to complain when they are hurt; they have a Right publicly to remonſtrate againſt the Abuſes of Power in the ſtrongeſt Terms, to put their Neighbours upon their Guard againſt the Craft or open Violence of Men in Authority, and to aſſert with Courage the Senſe they have of the Bleſſings of Liberty, the Value they put upon it, and their Reſolution at all Hazards to preſerve it, as one of the greateſt Bleſſings Heaven can beſtow. And when a Houſe of Aſſembly compoſed of honeſt Freemen ſees the general Bent of the People's Inclinations, That is it which muſt and will (I am ſure it ought to) weigh with a Legiſlature, in ſpite of all the Craft, Careſſing and Cajoling, made Uſe of by a Governor, to divert them from hearkening to the Voice of their Country. As we all very well underſtand the true Reaſon, why Gentlemen take ſo much Pains and make ſuch great Intereſt to be appointed Governors, ſo is the Deſign of their Appointment not leſs manifeſt. We know his Majeſty's gracious Intentions to his Subjects; he deſires no more than that his People in the Plantations ſhould be kept up to their Duty and Allegiance to the Crown of *Great-Britain*, that Peace may be preſerved amongſt them, and Juſtice impartially adminiſtered; that we may be

governed ſo as to render us uſeful to our Mother-country, by encouraging us to make and raiſe ſuch Commodities as may be uſeful to *Great-Britain*. But will any one ſay, that all or any of theſe good Ends are to be effected by a Governor's ſetting his People together by the Ears, and by the Aſſiſtance of one Part of the People to plague and plunder the other? The Commiſſion which Governors bear, while they execute the Powers given them, according to the Intent of the Royal Granter, expreſſed in their Commiſſions, requires and deſerves very great Reverence and Submiſſion: But when a Governor departs from the Duty enjoined him by his Sovereign, and acts as if he was leſs accountable than the Royal Hand that gave him all that Power and Honour which he is poſſeſſed of; this ſets People upon examining and enquiring into the Power, Authority and Duty of ſuch a Magiſtrate, and to compare thoſe with his Conduct; and juſt as far as they find he exceeds the Bounds of his Authority, or falls ſhort in doing impartial Juſtice to the People under his Adminiſtration, ſo far they very often, in return, come ſhort in their Duty to ſuch a Governor. Power alone will not make a Man beloved; and I have heard it obſerved, That the Man who was neither good nor wiſe before his being made a Governor, never mended upon his Preferment; but has been generally obſerved to be worſe: For Men who are not endued with Wiſdom and Virtue, can only be kept in Bounds by the Law; and by how much the further they think themſelves out of the Reach of the Law, by ſo much the more wicked and cruel Men are. I wiſh there were no Inſtances of the Kind at this Day. And wherever this happens to be Caſe of a Governor, unhappy are the People under his Adminiſtration, and in the End he will find himſelf ſo too; for the People will neither love him nor ſupport him. I make no Doubt but there are thoſe here, who are zealouſly concerned for the Succeſs of this Proſecution; and yet

I hope they are not many, and even ſome of thoſe, I am perſuaded, (when they conſider what Lengths ſuch Proſecutions may be carried, and how deeply the Liberties of the People may be affected by ſuch Means) will not all abide by their preſent Sentiments; I ſay, *Not All*: For the Man who from an Intimacy and Acquaintance with a Governor has conceived a perſonal Regard for him, the Man who has felt none of the Strokes of his Power, the Man who believes that a Governor has a Regard for him and confides in him, it is natural for ſuch Men to wiſh well to the Affairs of ſuch a Governor; and as they may be Men of Honour and Generoſity, may, and no Doubt will, wiſh him Succeſs, ſo far as the Rights and Privileges of their Fellow-Citizens are not affected. But as Men of Honour, I can apprehend nothing from them; they will never exceed that Point. There are others that are under ſtronger Obligations, and thoſe are ſuch as are in ſome ſort engaged in Support of a Governor's Cauſe, by their own or their Relations' Dependence on his Favour, for ſome Poſt or Preferment; ſuch Men have what is commonly called Duty and Gratitude, to influence their Inclinations, and oblige them to go his Lengths. I know Mens' Intereſts are very near to them, and they will do much rather than forego the Favour of a Governor, and a Livelihood at the ſame Time; but I can with very juſt Grounds hope, even from theſe Men, whom I will ſuppoſe to be Men of Honour and Conſcience too, that when they ſee the Liberty of their Country in Danger, either by their Concurrence, or even by their Silence, they will, like *Engliſhmen*, and like themſelves, freely make a Sacrifice of any Preferment or Favour rather than be acceſſary to deſtroying the Liberties of their Country, and entailing Slavery upon their Poſterity. There are indeed another ſet of Men, of whom I have no Hopes, I mean ſuch, who lay aſide all other Conſiderations, and are ready to join with Power in any Shape, and

with

with any Man or ſort of Men, by whoſe Means or Intereſt they may be aſſiſted to gratify their Malice and Envy againſt thoſe whom they have been pleaſed to hate; and that for no other Reaſon, but becauſe they are Men of Abilities and Integrity, or at leaſt are poſſeſſed of ſome valuable Qualities far ſuperior to their own. But as Envy is the Sin of the Devil, and therefore very hard, if at all, to be repented of, I will believe there are but few of this deteſtable and worthleſs ſort of Men, nor will their Opinions or Inclinations have any Influence upon this Trial. But to proceed; I beg Leave to inſiſt, That the Right of complaining or remonſtrating is natural; and the Reſtraint upon this natural Right is the Law only, and that thoſe Reſtraints can only extend to what is *falſe:* For as it is Truth alone which can excuſe or juſtify any Man for complaining of a bad Adminiſtration, I as frankly agree, that nothing ought to excuſe a Man who raiſes a falſe Charge or Accuſation even againſt a private Perſon, and that no manner of Allowance ought to be made him who does ſo againſt a public Magiſtrate. *Truth* ought to govern the whole Affair of Libels, and yet the Party accuſed runs Riſque enough even then; for if he fails of proving every Tittle of what he has wrote, and to the Satisfaction of the Court and Jury too, he may find to his Coſt, that, when the Proſecution it ſet on foot by Men in Power, it ſeldom wants Friends to favour it. And from thence (it is ſaid) has ariſen the great Diverſity of Opinions among Judges, about what Words were or were not ſcandalous or libellous. I believe it will be granted, that there is not greater Uncertainty in any Part of the Law, than about Words of Scandal; it would be miſpending of the Court's Time to mention the Caſes; they may be ſaid to be numberleſs; and therefore the utmoſt Care ought to be taken in following Precedents; and the Times when the Judgments were given, which are quoted for Authorities in the Caſe of Libels, are much to be re-

regarded. I think it will be agreed, That ever ſince the Time of the Star-Chamber, where the moſt arbitrary and deſtructive Judgments and Opinions were given, that ever an *Engliſhman* heard of, at leaſt in his own Country ; I ſay, Proſecutions for Libels ſince the Time of that arbitrary Court, and until the glorious Revolution, have generally been ſet on foot at the Inſtance of the Crown or its Miniſters ; and it is no ſmall Reproach to the Law, that theſe Proſecutions were too often and too much countenanced by the Judges, who held their Places at Pleaſure, (a diſagreeable Tenure to any Officer, but a dangerous one in the Caſe of a Judge.) To ſay more to this Point may not be proper. And yet I cannot think it unwarrantable, to ſhew the unhappy Influence that a Sovereign has ſometimes had, not only upon Judges, but even upon Parliaments themſelves.

It has already been ſhewn, how the Judges differed in their Opinions about the Nature of a Libel, in the Caſe of the Seven Biſhops. There you ſee three Judges of one Opinion, that is, of a wrong Opinion, in the Judgment of the beſt Men in *England*, and one Judge of a right Opinion. How unhappy might it have been for all of us at this Day, if that Jury had underſtood the Words in that Information as the Court did? Or if they had left it to the Court, to judge whether the Petition of the Biſhops was or was not a Libel? No! they took upon them, to their immortal Honour, to determine both *Law* and *Fact*, and to *underſtand* the Petition of the Biſhops *to be no Libel*, *that is*, *to contain no Falſhood nor Sedition*, and therefore found them *Not Guilty*. And remarkable is the Caſe of Sir *Samuel Barnardiſton*, who was fined 10,000 *l.* for writing a Letter, in which, it may be ſaid, none ſaw any Scandal or Falſhood but the Court and Jury ; for that Judgment was afterwards looked upon as a cruel and deteſtable Judgment, and therefore was reverſed

by

by Parliament. Many more Inſtances might be given of the Complaiſance of Court-Judges, about thoſe Times and before ; but I will mention only one Caſe more, and that is the Caſe of Sir *Edward Hales*, who, tho' a *Roman Catholic*, was by King *James* II. preferred to be a Colonel of his Army, notwithſtanding the Statute of 25 *Cha.* 2*d. Chap.* 2. by which it is provided, *That every one that accepts of an Office, Civil or Military, &c. ſhall take the Oaths, ſubſcribe the Declaration, and take the Sacrament, within three Months, &c. otherwiſe he is diſabled to hold ſuch Office, and the Grant for the ſame to be null and void, and the Party to forfeit* 500 l. Sir *Edward Hales* did not take the Oaths or Sacrament, and was proſecuted for the 500 *l.* for exerciſing the Office of a Colonel by the Space of three Months, without conforming as in the Act is directed. Sir *Edward* pleads, *That the King by his Letters-Patents did diſpenſe with his taking the Oaths and Sacrament, and ſubſcribing the Declaration, and had pardoned the Forfeiture of* 500 l. And *whether the King's Diſpenſation was good, againſt the ſaid Act of Parliament?* was the Queſtion. I ſhall mention no more of this Caſe, than to ſhew how in the Reign of an arbitrary Prince, where Judges hold their Seats at Pleaſure, their Determinations have not always been ſuch as to make Precedents of, but the contrary ; and ſo it happened in this Caſe where it was ſolemnly judged, *That, notwithſtanding this Act of Parliament, made in the ſtrongeſt Terms for Preſervation of the Proteſtant Religion, That yet the King had, by his Royal Prerogative, a Power to diſpenſe with that Law* ; and Sir *Edward Hales* was acquitted by the Judges accordingly. So the King's diſpenſing Power, being by the Judges ſet up above the Act of Parliament, this Law, which the People looked upon as their chief Security againſt Popery and Arbitrary Power, was by this Judgment rendered altogether ineffectual. But this Judgment

is ſufficiently expoſed by Sir *Edward Atkins*,* late one of the Judges of the Court of *Common-Pleas* in his *Enquiry into the King's Power of diſpenſing with pœnal Statutes*, where it is ſhewn, *Who it was that firſt invented Diſpenſations; how they came into* England; *what ill Uſe has been made of them there; and all this principally owing to the Countenance given them by the Judges.* He ſays of the Diſpenſing Power, † *The Pope was the Inventor of it; our Kings have borrowed it from them; and the Judges have from Time to Time nurſed and dreſſed it up, and given it Countenance; and it is ſtill upon the Growth, and encroaching, 'till it has almoſt ſubverted all Law, and made the Regal Power abſolute if not diſſolute.* This ſeems not only to ſhew how far Judges have been influenced by Power, and how little Caſes of this ſort, where the Prerogative has been in Queſtion in former Reigns, are to be relied upon for Law: But I think it plainly ſhews too, that a Man may uſe a greater Freedom with the Power of his Sovereign and the Judges in *Great-Britain*, than it ſeems he may with the Power of a Governor in the Plantations, who is but a Fellow-ſubject. Are theſe Words with which we are charged, like theſe? Do Mr. *Zenger*'s Papers contain any ſuch Freedoms with his Governor or his Council, as Sir *Edward Atkins* has taken with the Regal Power and the Judges in *England?* And yet I never heard of any Information brought againſt him for theſe Freedoms.

If then upon the whole there is ſo great an Uncertainty among Judges (learned and great Men) in Matters of this kind; if Power has had ſo great an Influence on Judges, how cautious ought we to be in determining by their Judgments, eſpecially in the Plantations, and in the Caſe of Libels? There is Hereſy in Law, as well as in Religion, and both have changed very

* Sir *Edward Atkins*'s *Enquiry* into the Power of diſpenſing with pœnal Statutes.

† Poſtſcript to the *Enquiry*, *pag.* 51.

very much ; and we well know, that it is not two Centuries ago that a Man would have been burnt as an heretic, for owning ſuch Opinions in Matters of Religion as are publicly wrote and printed at this Day. They were fallible Men, it ſeems, and we take the Liberty not only to differ from them in religious Opinions, but to condemn them and their Opinions too ; and I muſt preſume, that in taking theſe Freedoms in thinking and ſpeaking about Matters of Faith or Religion, we are in the right : For, tho' it is ſaid there are very great Liberties of this kind taken in *New-York*, yet I have heard of no Information preferred by Mr. Attorney for any Offences of this ſort. From which I think it is pretty clear, That in *New-York* a Man may make very free with his God, but he muſt take ſpecial Care what he ſays of his Governor. It is agreed upon by all Men that this is a Reign of Liberty, and while Men keep within the Bounds of Truth, I hope they may with Safety both ſpeak and write their Sentiments of the Conduct of Men in Power, I mean of that Part of their Conduct only, which affects the Liberty or Property of the People under their Adminiſtration. Were this to be denied, then the next Step may make them Slaves : For what Notions can be entertained of Slavery, beyond that of ſuffering the greateſt Injuries and Oppreſſions, without the Liberty of complaining ; or if they do, to be deſtroyed, Body and Eſtate, for ſo doing.

It is ſaid and inſiſted on by Mr. Attorney, *That Government is a ſacred Thing ; That it is to be ſupported and reverenced ; It is Government that protects our Perſons and Eſtates ; That prevents Treaſons, Murders, Robberies, Riots, and all the Train of Evils that overturns Kingdoms and States, and ruins particular Perſons ; and if thoſe in the Adminiſtration, eſpecially the Supreme Magiſtrate, muſt have all their Conduct cenſured by private Men, Government cannot ſubſiſt.* This is called *a Licentiouſneſs not to be tollerated.* It is ſaid, *That it brings*

the

the Rulers of the People into Contempt, and their Authority not be regarded, and ſo in the End the Laws cannot be put in Execution. Theſe I ſay, and ſuch as theſe, are the general Topics inſiſted upon by Men in Power, and their Advocates. But I wiſh it might be conſidered at the ſame Time, how often it has happened, that the Abuſe of Power has been the primary Cauſe of theſe Evils, and that it was the Injuſtice and Oppreſſion of theſe great Men, which has commonly brought them into Contempt with the People. The Craft and Art of ſuch Men is great, and who, that is the leaſt acquainted with Hiſtory or Law, can be ignorant of the ſpecious Pretences, which have often been made uſe of by Men in Power, to introduce arbitrary Rule, and deſtroy the Liberties of a free People. I will give two Inſtances; and as they are Authorities not to be denied, nor can be miſunderſtood, I preſume they will be ſufficient.

The *firſt* is the Statute of 3d of *Hen.* 7. *Cap.* 1. The Preamble of the Statute will prove all, and more than I have alleged. It begins, "*The King Our Sovereign Lord remembereth how by unlawful Maintenances, giving of Liveries, Signs and Tokens, &c. untrue Demeanings of Sheriffs in making of Pannels, and other untrue Returns, by taking of Money, by Injuries, by great Riots and unlawful Aſſemblies; the Policy and good Rule of this Realm is almoſt ſubdued; and for the not puniſhing theſe Inconveniences, and by Occaſion of the Premiſſes, little or nothing may be found by Inquiry, &c. to the Increaſe of Murders, &c. and Unſureties of all Men living, and Loſſes of their Lands and Goods.*" Here is a fine and ſpecious Pretence for introducing the Remedy, as it is called, which is provided by this Act, *that is*; inſtead of being lawfully accuſed by 24 good and lawful Men of the Neighbourhood, and afterwards tried by 12 like lawful Men, here is a Power given to the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treaſurer, the Keeper of the King's Privy-Seal, or two of them, calling to them a Biſhop,

a temporal Lord, and other great Men mentioned in the Act, (who, it is to be obſerved, were all to be Dependents on the Court) to receive Information againſt any Perſon for any of the Miſbehaviours recited in that Act, and at their Diſcretion to examine and to puniſh them according to their Demerit.

The ſecond Statute I propoſed to mention, is the 11th of the ſame King, *Cap.* 3. the Preamble of which Act has the like fair Pretences as the former; *for the King calling to his Remembrance the good Laws made againſt the receiving of Liveries, &c. unlawful Extortions, Maintenances, Embracery, &c. unlawful Games, &c. and many other great Enormities, and Offences committed againſt many good Statutes, to the Diſpleaſure of Almighty God, which,* the Act ſays, *could not, nor yet can, be conveniently puniſhed by the due Order of the Law, except it were firſt found by* 12 *Men, &c. which, for the Cauſes aforeſaid, will not find nor yet preſent the Truth.* And therefore the ſame Statute directs, *that the Juſtices of Aſſize, and Juſtices of the Peace, ſhall upon Information for the King before them made, have full Power, by their Diſcretion, to hear and determine all ſuch Offences.* Here are two Statutes that are allowed to have given the deepeſt Wound to the Liberties of the People of *England* of any that I remember to have been made, unleſs it may be ſaid, that the Statute made in the Time of *Henry* VIIIth, by which his Proclamations were to have the Effect of Laws, might in its Conſequence be worſe. And yet we ſee the plauſible Pretences found out by the great Men to procure theſe Acts. And it may juſtly be ſaid, That by thoſe Pretences the People of *England* were cheated or awed into the delivering up their antient and ſacred Right of Trials by *Grand* and *Petit Juries.* I hope to be excuſed for this Expreſſion, ſeeing my Lord *Coke* (in his 4th *Inſtitute)* calls it *an unjuſt and ſtrange Act, that tended in its Execution to the great Diſpleaſure of Almighty God, and the utter Subverſion of the common Law.*

Theſe,

Theſe, I think, make out what I alleged, and are flagrant Inſtances of the Influence of Men in Power, even upon the Repreſentatives of a whole Kingdom. From all which I hope it will be agreed, that it is a Duty which all good Men owe to their Country, to guard againſt the unhappy Influence of ill Men when intruſted with Power, and eſpecially againſt their Creatures and Dependents, who, as they are generally more neceſſitous, are ſurely more covetous and cruel. But it is worthy of Obſervation, that tho' the Spirit of Liberty was borne down and oppreſſed in *England* at that Time, yet it was not loſt; for the Parliament laid hold of the firſt Opportunity to free the Subject from the many inſufferable Oppreſſions and Outrages committed upon their Perſons and Eſtates by Colour of theſe Acts, the laſt of which being deemed the moſt grievous, was repealed in the firſt Year of *Henry* VIIIth. Tho' it is to be obſerved, that *Henry* VIIth and his Creatures reaped ſuch great Advantages by the grievous Oppreſſions and Exactions, *grinding the Faces of the poor Subjects*, as my Lord *Coke* ſays, by Colour of this Statute by Information only, that a Repeal of this Act could never be obtained during the Life of that Prince. The other Statute, being the favourite Law for ſupporting arbitrary Power, was continued much longer. The Execution of it was by the great Men of the Realm; and how they executed it, the Senſe of the Kingdom, expreſſed in the 17th of *Charles* Iſt, (by which the Court of Star-Chamber, the Soil where Informations grew rankeſt) will beſt declare. In that Statute *Magna Charta*, and the other Statutes made in the Time of *Edward* III. which, I think, are no leſs than five, are particularly enumerated as Acts, by which the Liberties and Privileges of the People of *England* were ſecured to them, againſt ſuch oppreſſive Courts as the Star-Chamber and others of the like Juriſdiction. And the Reaſon aſſigned for their pulling down the Star-Chamber, is, *That the Proceedings, Cenſures*

ſures and Decrees of the Court of Star-Chamber, even tho' the great Men of the Realm, nay, and a Biſhop too (holy Man) *were Judges, had by Experience been found to be an intolerable Burthen to the Subject, and the Means to introduce an arbitrary Power and Government.* And therefore, that Court was taken away, with all the other Courts in that Statute mentioned, having like Juriſdiction.

I do not mention this Statute, as if, by the taking away the Court of Star-Chamber, the Remedy for many of the Abuſes or Offences cenſured there, was likewiſe taken away; no, I only intend by it to ſhew, that the People of *England* ſaw clearly the Danger of truſting their Liberties and Properties to be tried, even by the greateſt Men in the Kingdom, without the Judgment of a Jury of their Equals. They had felt the terrible Effects of leaving it to the Judgment of theſe great Men to ſay what was *ſcandalous and ſeditious, falſe or ironical.* And if the Parliament of *England* thought this Power of judging was too great to be truſted with Men of the firſt Rank in the Kingdom, without the Aid of a Jury, how ſacred ſoever their Characters might be, and therefore reſtored to the People their original Right of Trial by Juries, I hope to to be excuſed for inſiſting, that by the Judgment of a Parliament, from whence no Appeal lies, the Jury are the proper Judges, of what is *falſe* at leaſt, if not of what is *ſcandalous and ſeditious.* This is an Authority not to be denied; it is as plain as it is great; and to ſay, that this Act indeed did reſtore to the People Trials by Juries, which was not the Practice of Star-Chamber, but that did not give the Jurors any new Authority, or any Right to try Matters of Law, I ſay this Objection will not avail; for I muſt inſiſt, that where Matter of Law is complicated with Matter of Fact, the Jury have a Right to determine both. As for Inſtance; upon Indictment for Murder, the Jury may, and almoſt conſtantly do, take upon them to judge

judge whether the Evidence will amount to Murder or Manſlaughter, and find accordingly; and I muſt ſay I cannot ſee, why in our Caſe the Jury have not at leaſt as good a Right to ſay, whether our News-papers are a Libel or no Libel, as another Jury has to ſay, whether killing of a Man is Murder or Manſlaughter. The Right of the Jury, to find ſuch a Verdict as they in their Conſcience do think is agreeable to their Evidence, is ſupported by the Authority of *Buſhel*'s Caſe, *Vaughan's Reports*, *p.* 135. beyond any Doubt. For, in the Argument of that Caſe, the Chief Juſtice, who delivered the Opinion of the Court, lays it down for Law, (*Vaughan's Reports*, *p.* 150.) "That in all general Iſſues; as upon *Non Cul.* in *Treſpaſs*, *Non Tort. Nul Diſſeizin* in Aſſize, *&c.* tho' it is Matter of Law, whether the Defendant is a Treſpaſſer, a Diſſeizer, *&c.* in the particular Caſes in Iſſue, yet the Jury find not (as in a ſpecial Verdict) the Fact of every Caſe, leaving the Law to the Court; but find for the Plaintiff or Defendant upon the Iſſue to be tried, wherein they reſolve both Law and Fact complicately." It appears by the ſame Caſe, that tho' the diſcreet and lawful Aſſiſtance of the Judge, by way of Advice to the Jury, may be uſeful; yet that Advice or Direction ought always to be *upon Suppoſition*, *and not poſitive*, *and upon Coerſion.* (*p.* 144.) The Reaſon given in the ſame Book (*p.* 147.) is, "Becauſe the Judge (as Judge) cannot know what the Evidence is which the Jury have, *that is*, he can only know the Evidence given in Court; but the Evidence which the Jury have, may be of their own Knowlege, as they are returned of the Neighbourhood. They may alſo know from their own Knowlege, that what is ſworn in Court is not true; and they may know the Witneſſes to be ſtigmatized, to which the Court may be Strangers." But what ſpeaks moſt to my Purpoſe, is, that ſuppoſe the Court did really know all the Evidence the Jury know, yet in that Caſe it is agreed, "That the Judge and

Jury

Jury may differ in the Reſult of their Evidence as well as two Judges may," which often happens. And (*p.* 148.) the Judge ſubjoins the Reaſon, why it is no Crime for a Jury to differ in Opinion from the Court, where he ſays, "That a Man cannot ſee with another's Eye, nor hear by another's Ear; no more can a Man conclude or infer the Thing by another's Underſtanding or Reaſoning." From all which (I inſiſt) it is very plain, "That the Jury are by Law at Liberty (without any Affront to the Judgment of the Court) to find both the Law and the Fact, in our Caſe," as they did in the Caſe I am ſpeaking to, which I will beg Leave juſt to mention, and it was this. Mr. *Penn* and *Mead* being Quakers, and having met in a peaceable Manner, after being ſhut out of their Meeting-Houſe, preached in *Grace-Church-Street* in *London*, to the People of their own Perſuaſion, and for this they were indicted; and it was ſaid, "That they with other Perſons, to the Number of 300, unlawfully and tumultuouſly aſſembled, to the Diſturbance of the Peace, *&c.*" To which they pleaded, *Not Guilty*. And the Petit Jury being ſworn to try the Iſſue between the King and the Priſoners, that is, whether they were Guilty, according to the Form of the Indictment; here there was no Diſpute but they were aſſembled together, to the Number mentioned in the Indictment; But, "Whether that Meeting together was riotouſly, tumultuouſly, and to the Diſturbance of the Peace, was the Queſtion." And the Court told the Jury *it was*, and ordered the Jury to find it ſo: "For *(ſaid the Court)* the Meeting was the Matter of Fact, and that is confeſſed, and we tell you it is unlawful, for it is againſt the Statute; and the Meeting being unlawful, it follows of Courſe that it was tumultuous, and to the Diſturbance of the Peace." But the Jury did not think fit to take the Court's Word for it; for they could neither find *Riot*, *Tumult*, or any thing tending to the *Breach of the Peace*, committed at that Meeting;

and

and they acquitted Mr. *Penn* and *Mead*. In doing of which they took upon them to judge both the *Law* and the *Fact*, at which the Court (being themſelves true Courtiers) were ſo much offended, that they fined the Jury 40 Marks a-piece, and committed them till paid. But Mr. *Buſhel*, who valued the Right of a Juryman and the Liberty of his Country more than his own, refuſed to pay the Fine, and was reſolved (tho' at a great Expence and Trouble too) to bring, and did bring, his *Habeas Corpus*, to be relieved from his Fine and Impriſonment, and he was releaſed accordingly; and this being the Judgment in his Caſe, it is eſtabliſhed for Law, "That the Judges, how great ſoever they be, have no Right to fine, impriſon, or puniſh a Jury, for not finding a Verdict according to the Direction of the Court." And this I hope is ſufficient to prove, That Jurymen are to ſee with their own Eyes, to hear with their own Ears, and to make Uſe of their own Conſciences and Underſtandings, in judging of the Lives, Liberties or Eſtates of their Fellow-ſubjects. And ſo I have done with this Point.

This is the ſecond Information for libelling of a Governor that I have known in *America*: And the firſt, tho' it may look like a Romance; yet, as it is true, I will beg Leave to mention it. Governor *Nicholſon*, who happened to be offended with one of his Clergy, met him one Day upon the Road, and as was uſual with him (under the Protection of his Commiſſion) uſed the Parſon with the worſt of Language, threatened to cut off his Ears, ſlit his Noſe, and at laſt to ſhoot him through the Head. The Parſon, being a reverend Man, continued all this Time uncovered in the Heat of the Sun, until he found an Opportunity to fly for it; and coming to a Neighbour's Houſe felt himſelf very ill of a Fever, and immediately writes for a Doctor; and that his Phyſician might be the better Judge of his Diſtemper, he acquainted him with

the Uſage he had received ; concluding, that the Governor was certainly mad, for that no Man in his Senſes would have behaved in that manner. The Doctor unhappily ſhews the Parſon's Letter ; the Governor came to hear of it ; and ſo an Information was preferred againſt the poor Man, for ſaying *he believed the Governor was mad* ; and it was laid in the Information to be *falſe, ſcandalous and wicked, and wrote with Intent to move Sedition among the People, and bring His Excellency into Contempt*. But, by an Order from the late Queen *Anne*, there was a Stop put to that Proſecution, with ſundry others, ſet on foot by the ſame Governor againſt Gentlemen of the greateſt Worth and Honour in that Government.

And may not I be allowed, after all this, to ſay, That, by a little Countenance, almoſt any thing which a Man writes, may, with the Help of that uſeful Term of Art called an *Innuendo*, be conſtrued to be a Libel, according to Mr. Attorney's Definition of it, That *whether the Words are ſpoke of a Perſon of a public Character, or of a private Man, whether dead or living, good or bad, true or falſe*, all make a Libel ; for, according to Mr. Attorney, *after a Man hears a Writing read, or reads and repeats it, or laughs at it, they are all puniſhable*. It is true, Mr. Attorney is ſo good as to allow, *after the Party knows it to be a Libel*, but he is not ſo kind as to take the Man's Word for it.

[Here were ſeveral Caſes put to ſhew, That tho' what a Man writes of a Governor was true, proper and neceſſary ; yet, according to the foregoing Doctrine, it might be conſtrued to be a Libel : But Mr. *Hamilton*, after the Trial was over, being informed, That ſome of the Caſes he had put had really happened in this Government, he declared he had never heard of any ſuch ; and as he meant no perſonal Reflections, he was ſorry he had

had mentioned them, and therefore they are omitted here.]

Mr. *Hamilton.* If a Libel is underſtood in the large and unlimited Senſe urged by Mr. Attorney, there is a ſcarce a Writing I know that may not be called a Libel, or ſcarce any Perſon ſafe from being called to Account as a Libeller: For *Moſes*, meek as he was, libelled *Cain*; and who is it that has not libelled the Devil? For, according to Mr. Attorney, it is no Juſtification to ſay one has a bad Name. *Echard* has libelled our good King *William*: *Burnet* has libelled, among many others, King *Charles* and King *James*; and *Rapin* has libelled them all. How muſt a Man ſpeak or write, or what muſt he hear, read, or ſing, or when muſt he laugh, ſo as to be ſecure from being taken up as a Libeller? I ſincerely believe, that were ſome Perſons to go thro' the Streets of *New-York* now-a-days, and read a Part of the Bible, if it was not known to be ſuch, Mr. Attorney, with the Help of his *Innuendoes*, would eaſily turn it into a Libel. As for Inſtance, *Iſ.* ix. 16. *The Leaders of the People cauſe them to err, and they that are led by them are deſtroyed.* But ſhould Mr. Attorney go about to make this a Libel, he would read it thus: *The Leaders of the People* [*Innuendo*, the Governor and Council of *New-York*] *cauſe them* [*Innuendo*, the People of this Province] *to err, and they* [the People of this Province meaning] *are deſtroyed* [*Innuendo*, are deceived into the Loſs of their Liberty] which is the worſt kind of Deſtruction. Or if ſome Perſon ſhould publicly repeat, in a Manner not pleaſing to his Betters, the 10th and 11th Verſes of the lvith Chap. of the ſame Book, there Mr. Attorney would have a large Field to diſplay his Skill, in the artful Application of his *Innuendoes*. The Words are, *His Watchmen are all blind, they are ignorant, &c. Yea, they are greedy Dogs, that can never have enough.* But to make them a Libel, there is, according to Mr.

Attorney's Doctrine, no more wanting but the Aid of his Skill in the right adapting his *Innuendoes*. As for Inſtance: *His Watchmen* [*Innuendo*, the Governor's Council and Aſſembly] *are blind, they are ignorant* [*Innuendo*, will not ſee the dangerous Deſigns of His Excellency] *Yea, they* [the Governor and Council meaning] *are greedy Dogs, which can never have enough* [*Innuendo*, enough of Riches and Power.] Such an Inſtance as this ſeems only fit to be laughed at; but I may appeal to Mr. Attorney himſelf, whether theſe are not at leaſt equally proper to be applied to His Excellency and His Miniſters, as ſome of the Inferences and *Innuendoes* in his Information againſt my Client. Then, if Mr. Attorney is at Liberty to come into Court, and file an Information in the King's Name, without Leave, who is ſecure whom he is pleaſed to proſecute as a Libeller? And as the Crown-Law is contended for in bad Times, there is no Remedy for the greateſt Oppreſſion of this ſort, even tho' the Party proſecuted is acquitted with Honour. And give me Leave to ſay, as great Men as any in *Britain* have boldly aſſerted, That the Mode of proſecuting by *Information* (when a Grand Jury will not find *Billa vera*) is a national Grievance, and greatly inconſiſtent with that Freedom which the Subjects of *England* enjoy in moſt other Caſes. But, if we are ſo unhappy as not to be able to ward off this Stroke of Power directly; yet let us take Care not to be cheated out of our Liberties, by Forms and Appearances: Let us always be ſure, that the Charge in the Information is made out clearly even beyond a Doubt; for tho' Matters in the Information may be called *Form* upon Trial, yet they may be, and often have been found to be, *Matters of Subſtance* upon giving Judgment.

Gentlemen, The Danger is great, in Proportion to the Miſchief that may happen, through our too great Credulity. A proper Confidence in a Court is commendable; but as the Verdict (whatever it is) will be

yours,

yours, you ought to refer no Part of your Duty to the Diſcretion of other Perſons. If you ſhould be of Opinion, that there is no Falſhood in Mr. *Zenger*'s Papers, you will, nay (pardon me for the Expreſſion) you ought to ſay ſo; becauſe you do not know, whether others (I mean the Court) may be of that Opinion. It is your Right to do ſo, and there is much depending upon your Reſolution, as well as upon your Integrity.

The Loſs of Liberty to a generous Mind, is worſe than Death; and yet we know there have been thoſe in all Ages, who, for the ſake of Preferment or ſome imaginary Honour, have freely lent a helping Hand, to oppreſs, nay to deſtroy, their Country. This brings to my Mind that ſaying of the immortal *Brutus*, when he looked upon the Creatures of *Cæſar*, who were very great Men, but by no Means good Men. "*You*, Romans, *ſaid* Brutus, *if yet I may call you ſo, conſider what you are doing; remember that you are aſſiſting* Cæſar *to forge thoſe very Chains, which one day he will make yourſelves wear.*" This is what every Man (who values Freedom) ought to conſider: He ſhould act by Judgment, and not by Affection or Self-Intereſt; for, where theſe prevail, no Ties of either Country or Kindred are regarded: As on the other hand, the Man, who loves his Country, prefers its Liberty to all other Conſiderations; well knowing that, without Liberty, Life is a Miſery.

A famous Inſtance of this you will find in the Hiſtory of another brave *Roman* of the ſame Name: I mean *Lucius Junius Brutus*, whoſe Story is well known, and therefore I ſhall mention no more of it, than only to ſhew the Value he put upon the Freedom of his Country. This great Man, aſſiſted by a few Fellow-Citizens whom he had engaged in the Cauſe, had baniſhed *Tarquin* the Proud, the laſt King of *Rome*, from a Throne he had aſcended by inhuman Murders, and poſſeſſed by the moſt dreadful Tyranny and Proſcriptions:

tions: But *Tarquin*, by theſe Means, had amaſſed incredible Riches; even ſufficient to bribe many of the young Nobility of *Rome*, to aſſiſt him in recovering the Crown. The Plot however being diſcovered, the principal Conſpirators were apprehended, among whom were two of the Sons of *Junius Brutus*. It was abſolutely neceſſary that ſome ſhould be made Examples of, to deter others from attempting the reſtoring of *Tarquin*, and deſtroying the Liberty of *Rome*. And to effect this it was, that *Lucius Junius Brutus*, one of the Conſuls of *Rome*, in the Preſence of the *Roman* People, ſat Judge and condemned his own Sons, as Traitors to their Country: And to give the laſt Proof of his exalted Virtue, and his Love of Liberty, he, with a Firmneſs of Mind only becoming ſo great a Man, cauſed their Heads to be ſtruck off in his own Preſence; and when he obſerved that his rigid Virtue occaſioned a ſort of Horror among the People, it is obſerved he only ſaid, "*My Fellow-Citizens, do not think that this proceeds from any Want of natural Affection: No, The Death of the Sons of* Brutus *can affect* Brutus *only; but the Loſs of Liberty will affect my Country.*" Thus highly was Liberty eſteemed in thoſe Days, that a Father could ſacrifice his Sons to ſave his Country. But why do I go to Heathen *Rome*, to bring Inſtances of the Love of Liberty: The beſt Blood in *Britain* has been ſhed in the Cauſe of Liberty; and the Freedom we enjoy at this day, may be ſaid to be, in a great Meaſure, owing to the glorious Stand the famous *Hampden*, and others of our Countrymen, made againſt the arbitrary Demands, and illegal Impoſitions, of the Times in which they lived; who rather than give up the Rights of *Engliſhmen*, and ſubmit to pay an illegal Tax of no more, I think, than *Three Shillings*, reſolved to undergo, and for the Liberty of their Country did undergo, the greateſt Extremities, in that arbitrary and terrible Court of Star-Chamber, to whoſe arbitrary Proceedings (it being compoſed of the principal

cipal Men of the Realm, and calculated to ſupport arbitrary Government) no Bounds or Limits could be ſet, nor could any other Hand remove the Evil but a Parliament.

Power may juſtly be compared to a great River, which, kept within due Bounds, is both beautiful and uſeful; but when it overflows its Banks, it is then too impetuous to be ſtemmed; it bears down all before it, and brings Deſtruction and Deſolation wherever it comes. If then this is the Nature of Power, let us at leaſt do our Duty, and like wiſe Men (who value Freedom) uſe our utmoſt Care to ſupport Liberty, the only Bulwark againſt lawleſs Power, which in all Ages has ſacrificed to its wild Luſt and boundleſs Ambition, the Blood of the beſt Men that ever lived.

I hope to be pardoned, Sir, for my Zeal upon this Occaſion: It is an old and wiſe Caution, *That when our Neighbour's Houſe is on Fire, we ought to take Care of our own.* For tho', bleſſed be God, I live in a Government where Liberty is well underſtood, and freely enjoyed; yet Experience has ſhewn us all (I am ſure it has to me) that a bad Precedent in one Government is ſoon ſet up for an Authority in another; and therefore I cannot but think it mine, and every honeſt Man's Duty, that (while we pay all due Obedience to Men in Authority) we ought at the ſame Time to be upon our Guard againſt Power, whenever we apprehend it may injuriouſly affect ourſelves or our Fellow-ſubjects.

I am truly very unequal to ſuch an Undertaking on many Accounts. And you ſee I labour under the Weight of many Years, and am borne down with great Infirmities of Body; yet old and weak as I am, I ſhould think it my Duty, if required, to go to the utmoſt Part of the Land, where my Service could be of any Uſe in aſſiſting to quench the Flame of Proſecutions upon Informations, ſet on foot by the Government, to deprive a People of the Right of remonſtra-

ting,

ting, and complaining of, the arbitrary Attempts of Men in Power. Men who injure and oppreſs the People under their Adminiſtration provoke them to cry out and complain; and then make that very Complaint the Foundation for new Oppreſſions and Proſecutions. I wiſh I could ſay there were no Inſtances of this kind. But to conclude; the Queſtion before the Court and you, Gentlemen of the Jury, is not of ſmall or private Concern; it is not the Cauſe of a poor Printer, nor of *New-York* alone, which you are now trying: No! It may, in its Conſequence, affect every Freeman that lives under a *Britiſh* Government on the Main of *America*. It is the beſt Cauſe: It is the Cauſe of Liberty! And I make no Doubt but your upright Conduct, this Day, will not only entitle you to the Love and Eſteem of your Fellow-Citizens; but every Man, who prefers Freedom to a Life of Slavery, will bleſs and honour you, as Men who have baffled the Attempt of Tyranny, and who, by an impartial and uncorrupt Verdict, have laid a noble Foundation for ſecuring to ourſelves, our Poſterity, and our Neighbours, That, to which Nature and the Laws of our Country have given us a Right,—*The Liberty—both of expoſing and oppoſing arbitrary Power (in theſe Parts of the World, at leaſt) by ſpeaking and writing Truth.*

[Here Mr. Attorney obſerved, that Mr. *Hamilton* had gone very much out of the Way, and had made himſelf and the People very merry: But that he had been citing Caſes, not at all to the Purpoſe. He ſaid, there was no ſuch Cauſe as Mr. *Buſhel*'s or Sir *Edward Hales* before the Court; and he could not find out what the Court or Jury had to do with Diſpenſations, Riots or unlawful Aſſemblies: All that the Jury had to conſider of, was Mr. *Zenger*'s printing and publiſhing two ſcandalous Libels, which very highly reflected on his Excellency and the principal Men concerned

in

in the Adminiſtration of this Government, which is confeſſed. That is, the printing and publiſhing of the Journals ſet forth in the Information is confeſſed. And concluded, that as Mr. *Hamilton* had confeſſed the Printing, and there could be no doubt but they were ſcandalous Papers, highly reflecting upon his Excellency, and the principal Magiſtrates in the Province; and therefore he made no doubt but the Jury would find the Defendent *Guilty*, and would refer to the Court for their Direction.

Mr. Ch. Juſt. Gentlemen of the Jury: The great Pains Mr. *Hamilton* has taken, to ſhew how little Regard Juries are to pay to the Opinion of the Judges; and his inſiſting ſo much upon the Conduct of ſome Judges in Trials of this kind, is done no doubt with a Deſign that you ſhould take very little notice of what I may ſay upon this Occaſion. I ſhall therefore only obſerve to you, that, as the Facts or Words in the Information are confeſſed, the only Thing that can come in Queſtion before you is, whether the Words, as ſet forth in the Information, make a Libel. And that is a Matter of Law, no doubt, and which you may leave to the Court. But I ſhall trouble you no further with any thing more of my own, but read to you the Words of a learned and upright Judge * in a Caſe of the like Nature:

" To ſay that corrupt Officers are appointed to adminiſter Affairs, is certainly a Reflection on the Government. If People ſhould not be called to account for poſſeſſing the People with an ill Opinion of the Govern-nment, no Government can ſubſiſt: For it is very neceſſary for all Governments, that the People ſhould have a good Opinion of it. And nothing can be worſe to any Government, than to endeavour to procure Animoſities: As to the Management of them, this has

 been

* Ch. J. *Holt*, in *Tutchin*'s Caſe.

been always looked upon as a Crime; and no Government can be ſafe without it be puniſhed."

Now you are to conſider, whether theſe Words I have read to you, do not tend to beget an ill Opinion of the Adminiſtration of the Government? To tell us, thoſe who are employed know nothing of the Matter, and thoſe who do know are not employed; Men are not adapted to Offices, but Offices to Men, out of a particular Regard to their Intereſt, and not to their Fitneſs for the Places; this is the Purport of theſe Papers.

Mr. *Hamilton.* I humbly beg your Honour's Pardon; I am very much miſapprehended, if you ſuppoſe what I ſaid was ſo deſigned.

Sir, you know, I made an Apology for the Freedom I found myſelf under a Neceſſity of uſing upon this Occaſion. I ſaid, there was nothing perſonal deſigned; it aroſe from the Nature of our Defence.

The Jury withdrew, and in a ſmall Time returned, and being aſked by the Clerk, "Whether they were agreed of their Verdict, and whether *John Peter Zenger* was guilty of printing and publiſhing the Libels in the Information mentioned?" They anſwered by *Thomas Hunt*, their Foreman, NOT GUILTY.

Upon which there were three Huzzas in the Hall, which crowded with People; and the next Day *Zenger* was diſcharged from his Impriſonment.

A P-

APPENDIX.

City of *New-York*. } *ss.* AT a Common-council, held at the City-hall of the said City, on *Tuesday* the Sixteenth Day of *September*, A. D. 1735.

PRESENT.

Paul Richards, Esq; Mayor.
Gerardus Stuyvesant, Esq; Deputy-Mayor.
Daniel Horsmanden, Esq; Recorder.

William Roome, Esq; } Aldermen. { *Christopher Fell*, Esq;
Simon Johnson, Esq; { *Stephen Bayard*, Esq;
John Walter, Esq; { *Johannes Burger*, Esq;

Mr. *Johan. Waldron*, } Assistants. { Mr. *John Fred*,
Mr. *Ede Myer*, { Mr. *Charles Le Roux*,
Mr. *John Moor*, { Mr. *Evert Byvanck*.

Ordered, "That *Andrew Hamilton*, Esq; of *Philadelphia*, Barrister at Law, be presented with the Freedom of this Corporation; and that Alderman *Bayard*, Alderman *Johnson*, and Alderman *Fell*, be a Committee to bring in a Draught thereof."

Accordingly, on *Monday* the 29th of *September*, the above Gentlemen, at a Common-council, produced the Grant of the Freedom, a Copy of which follows:

City of *New-York*. } *ss.* *PAUL RICHARDS*, Esq; the Recorder, Aldermen, and Assistants of the City of *New-York*, convened in Common-council, To all to whom these Presents shall come Greeting. *WHEREAS*, Honour is the just Reward of Virtue, and public Benefits demand a public Acknowlegement. We therefore, under a grateful Sense of the remarkable Service done to the Inhabitants of this City and Colony, by *Andrew Hamilton*, Esq; of *Pensilvania*, Barrister at Law, by his learned and generous Defence of the Rights of Mankind, and the Liberty of the Press, in the Case of *John Peter Zenger*, lately tried on an Information exhibited in the Supreme Court of this Colony, do by these Presents, bear to the said *Andrew Hamilton*, Esq; the public Thanks of

of the Freemen of this Corporation for that ſignal Service, which he chearfully undertook under great Indiſpoſition of Body, and generouſly performed, refuſing any Fee or Reward. And in Teſtimony of our great Eſteem for his Perſon, and Senſe of his Merit, do hereby preſent him with the Freedom of this Corporation. Theſe are therefore to certify and declare, that the ſaid *Andrew Hamilton*, Eſq; is hereby admitted, received and allowed a Freeman and Citizen of the ſaid City, to have, hold, enjoy and partake of all the Benefits, Privileges, Freedoms and Immunities whatſoever, granted or belonging to a Freeman and Citizen of the ſame City. *In Teſtimony* whereof, the Common-council of the ſaid City, in Common-council aſſembled, have cauſed the Seal of the ſaid City to be hereunto affixed this Twenty-ninth Day of *September*, *A. D. One Thouſand Seven Hundred and Thirty Five.*

By Order of Common-council, W. SHARPAS, *Cl.*

" And we do further Report, that ſundry of the Members of this Corporation and Gentlemen of this City have voluntarily contributed ſufficient for a Gold Box of Five Ounces and a Half, for incloſing the Seal of the ſaid Freedom; upon the Lid of which, we are of Opinion ſhould be engraved the Arms of the City of *New-York:* Witneſs our Hands this 29th Day of *Sept.* 1735.

Stephen Bayard, | *Simon Johnſon*, | *Chriſtopher Fell.*

This Report was unanimouſly approved; and the Freedom and Box was carried to *Philadelphia* by Ald. *Bayard*, and there gratefully accepted by Mr. *Hamilton.*

Round on the Lid of the Box was engraved, beſides the Arms of *New-York*, this Motto in a Garter:

DEMERSÆ LEGES — TIMEFACTA LIBERTAS — HÆC TANDEM EMERGUNT.

On the Inſide of the Lid, in a flying Garter, this:

NON NUMMIS,—VIRTUTE PARATUR.

On the Front of the Rim was Part of *Tully*'s Wiſh:

ITA CUIQUE EVENIAT, UT DE REPUBLICA MERUIT.

F I N I S.

D752
Z54